तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

VISVA BHARATI
LIBRARY
SANTINIKETAN

954.545
H 14C

THE CALL TO YOUNG INDIA

The Call to Young India

BY

LAJPAT RAI

S. GANESAN & CO.,
Triplicane, Madras, S.E.
1938

To Lajpat Rai.

By Mayce Seymour.

Each day our freedom must be freshly claimed;
It is no gift bestowed, but the prize we win
With the full measure of worship and devotion;
It lives, and like the temple of the dawn
Must be renewed with shafts of living fire:
It is an outward-reaching tree of life,
With roots of strength deep in our human needs,
And branches nesting God's eternal dreams.

They were brave hearts who crossed on exile path
The wintry seas, long centuries ago,
To seek asylum for their liberties.
Their day is past; yet still, lest we should lose
Our vision and our quest, they come and come,
Seekers of freedom, followers of the gleam.
From every shore poisoned by tyranny,
Or dreadened by the arrogance of might,
They come, the fearless hearts, the serene minds,
The tested wills, the dedicated lives,
To raise our faltering hope, restore our vision,
And link our frail wills to a deathless cause.

There is one destiny, and that mankind's
There is one good, the common good of all,
One fellowship, in which each race and state
Are names of peers, one dome of liberty,
Building forever by dedicated spirits
In answer to God's gift of boundless life.

PUBLISHERS' NOTE.

In bringing out this new addition to the political and general reform literature of India, the publishers feel that no word of apology is needed on their part. Lala Lajpat Rai now stands in the first ranks of Indian patriots, is a man of spotless character, unbounded enthusiasm for the country's cause, untiring earnestness, undaunted will and determination and uncommon abilities. To add to these very rare qualities, he has gathered an experience of men and matters the world over which challenges in depth as well as in range that of all other Indian patriots, experience which dates back to his teens. The writings and utterances of this born patriot, whose life is one long and continuous endeavour and work devoted to the cause of the country from the first, constitute a mine of wise sayings, fruitful advice and sound ideas. To consign them to oblivion were a national folly, if not a crime. It is the earnest hope of the publishers that our youths will in large numbers draw their inspiration for rendering national services of the right kind from the following pages.

CONTENTS



LALA LAJPAT RAI

Lajpat Rai: An Appreciation.

In the glorious galaxy of living eminent Indians who now adorn Indian public life, there is none more universally respected or more universally beloved, excluding Mr. Gandhi perhaps, than the great Panjab patriot, Lala Lajpat Rai. The mantle of Mr. Tilak as an All-India leader, if it is to fall on any one with any degree of appropriateness, will fall on Lajpat Rai by common consent. For the last now nearly forty years, almost since the very day on which he set up practice as a vakil in his eighteenth year in 1883, Lajpat Rai has laboured for our country's cause long and hard, none more strenuously, more insistently or with better concentration of purpose than he. For the same cause, he has travelled far and wide, has stayed long and studied long in three continents with attentive ears and

observant eyes whose attention no facts relevant to our country's progress escaped. For the same cause, too, he established a long, honourable, and strenuous connection with the Arya Samaj whose mainstay he was for many years and whose activities he not seldom inspired and directed. For the same cause, again, he lavishly spent his large, self-acquired earnings, the earnings of a capable and successful lawyer. For the same cause, in short, he has consecrated his whole life, his whole energies, his everything. Such a man deserves our earnest study; for, his ideas, his experiences, and his activities are calculated, if anything, to yield to us lessons of abiding utility and value.

The Hero as Nation-Builder.

And, let it be remembered, Lala Lajpat Rai was not what might perhaps be called without offence an imitation patriot. He was not a follower of this or that school of politicians or patriots or reformers; he owed allegiance to no parti-

cular party, no unquestioning obedience to any political or social master; for, his was a genius bubbling with original ideas, fertile in fruitful methods of political and social action. It was not, however, ostritch-like; for it did not refuse to draw nourishment from other like geniuses, here and elsewhere, dead and living. And it was multi-sided. Lajpat Rai combined in himself the religious fire of Vivekananda and Dayanand, the moral fervour of Gandhi and Tagore, the political vision of Tilak and Aurobindo Ghosh, the practical genius of Naoroji, Ranade and Gokhale. He has preached for the cause of his country with the ardour and religious zeal of a missionary; he has laboured for its poor and depressed as only a patriot can; has sacrificed his immense earnings for it with the readiness of a most generous-hearted and willing philanthropist; has suffered for it obloquy and exile with the conscious and victorious resignation of a great martyr. In him, the Hero appears and shines as a Nation-Builder.

Other patriots, Tilak and Gandhi, for instance, are Nation-Builders too, but with a difference. It is most instructive, it is essential, that we should study the different methods and the different modes of action which the differing geniuses of the different patriots have adopted in their endeavour to attain their common goal, so that we may, each one of us, in our more or less humble endeavour towards the same goal, choose that particular line of action which is best suited to our particular genius. Tilak, Gandhi, and Lajpat Rai, this trinity of patriots, exhibit, broadly speaking, each an aspect of the Hero as Nation-Builder. It is sometimes misleading to employ classical analogies and metaphors, but if we are careful not to strain them unduly, they would give us a better conception of the points of resemblance and difference between the subjects dealt with. Bearing this caution in mind and remembering that we are looking only for the dominant characterestics of the great personali-

Tilak, Gandhi and Lajpat Rai.

ties, we may say that while Tilak partook of the characteristics of the great Destroyer of the Puranic Trinity, Shiva, "easy to please and easier to displease," and Gandhi of those of Brahma, the Creator, Lajpat Rai partook of the characteristics of Vishnu the Preserver.

Tilak endeavoured to secure national freedom by attacking all kinds of external authority imposed on us without our consent with a view to exterminate them. National freedom was to be secured through the elimination of foreign domination. Tilak subordinated all other considerations to this supreme end. Till this end was secured, Tilak maintained, everything else, however urgent, however important, whether it be social reform or industrial development or the amelioration of the depressed classes, must wait. He suffered not a little obloquy for this obstinate clinging to his supreme end, but, unmindful of accusations that he was unsympathetic to the oppressed and the depressed, he firmly persevered in

his course. Gandhi's supreme mission is also to secure national freedom and national exaltation, but he hopes to secure it through the uplifting of the individual's character and the development of his soul-force. A society consecrated to justice, one taught to value moral force more than life and sternly and unflinchingly to act upon that teaching, cannot for a moment, says Mr. Gandhi, be servile. Given this vital force, this supreme force of character secured and guaranteed, a society will know no tyrants; and our endeavour must be, says this Brahma of the patriotic trinity under consideration, to create this vital force in us and strengthen it.

Mr. Lajpat Rai did not certainly underrate the need for political emancipation; indeed, he was one of those few people, excepting of course the people of Maharashtra, who heartily supported Tilak in the dark days of a decade and more ago when he was struggling hard against Mendicancy being exalted

to the position of a moral creed in Indian politics. Nor is Mr. Rai oblivious of the importance of character in national life; and in fact he was the first, if not the only one, among Indian politicians of any standing who extended support to Mr. Gandhi's audacious programme of Non-Co-operation with the Government to get the Khilafat and the Panjab wrongs righted. But neither unflinching attack on the bureaucracy nor a mission of moral regeneration was the dominant note in Mr. Lajapat Rai's activities. His peculiar mission was the improvement of social and national efficiency which will accelerate the attainment of national freedom and preserve it to the glory of the nation. In this respect, he seems to differ greatly from Gandhi. Mr. Rai is not a believer in mere simplicity of life and the development of soul-force. He wants to create in the people "an interest, a zest for real life." "The general prevailing idea of life in India," he says, "is that it is a necessary evil. That life itself is a misery and a misfortune from

which it is desirable to escape, is so deeply written in the soul of our people, that it is not easy to efface it. What India needs is an earnest, widely spread, persistent effort to preach and teach the gospel of life. That life is real, precious, earnest, invaluable, to be prized, preserved, prolonged and enjoyed, is not so obvious to our people as it should be." To make life richer, nobler and more varied in all its aspects, religious as well as social, economic as well as political, to preserve it and to progress it, is Mr. Lajpat Rai's gospel. To vary our simile used above and borrowing from the terminology used in ancient Indian society, we may perhaps say with an approach to truth that while Mr. Gandhi's outlook is that of the ancient Brahmin and Tilak's that of the ancient Kshatriya, Mr. Lajpat Rai's outlook is that of the ancient Vaisya, the caste to which, being a Bania, Lajpat himself belongs. To make of India a robust, wealthy, prosperous and strong nation is, then, Mr. Lajpat Rai's ambition.

Lajpat Rai's attitude to religion.

And to this end he devoted himself from the very commencement of his adolescence with a quiet heroism excelled in the life history of but a few martyrs. An intensely religious and devoted Hindu, by training as well as by temperament, Laipat Rai, when yet a student, was attracted by the preaching of Dayanand, the Founder of the Arya Samaj, as a reaction against the grossly heterodox and the rapidly denationalising tendencies of the Brahmo Samaj, on the one hand, and the crass superstition and the decadent priestcraft with which orthodox Hinduism had come to be identified. With his famous contemporaries and colleagues, Lala Hansraj, Guru Dutt Vidyarthi and Chethanand, Lajpat Rai threw himself whole-heartedly into this ameliorating movement with the enthtusiasm of a novitiate and the proselytising zeal of a missionary. It is well to remember in this connection that Lajpat Rai's religion was not of the market place or of the society or theocratic variety. His religion is of a nation-

building and nation-uplifting variety. "In judging of religion or of a system of religious beliefs," he wrote years ago, "what has to be seen is whether it gives sufficient importance to the different requirements and the different sides of human nature without sacrificing one for another. To be a perfect and sound religion, it must make adequate provision for the harmonious development of all these sides of human nature which are to form the basis of the upward progress of man. Such a religion cannot afford to neglect even the physical side, much less can it throw into the background the social." He does not of course mean to say that it should neglect the development of the individual soul. Indeed, he prided himself on the emphasis which Hinduism laid on individual spiritual development. Defending Hinduism against the attacks of those who contended that it looked only to the individual's spiritual salvation and was thus unsocial, if not anti-social, Lala Lajpat Rai wrote in his essay on the "Social Genius of Hinduism": "No reli-

gion can be worth its name which does not take sufficient care of the individual. The development of the individual soul and its attainment of spiritual beatitude must be the goal of all religions.... All purely spiritual development must, from the very nature of things, be individualistic, and it should be the ambition of every human being to strive after the elevation and refinement of spirit in him and thereby secure spiritual perfection resulting in perfect bliss, or (as some religions style it) salvation." But religion, in his view, has a duty to society and it is one of its supreme functions to forward and facilitate the advancement of society towards perfection through progress at once simultaneous and all-round.

Lajpat Rai as Social Worker.

To social progress, therefore, as a lever with which to hasten his country's progress to perfection, young Lajpat Rai turned his attention. The path of the social reformer in those days was not an easy one. On the one hand, there was

the orthodox party, vociferous, fanatical, obstructive and stern, who relentlessly threatened those who associated with the reformer with interdict and social ostracisim. On the other, there were the irreverent and the more or less agnostic heterodox who began to draw the nation along violently denationalising and sometimes tragically debasing currents of social change, opposition to whom meant obloquy among the English-educated countrymen and friends. Between these mutually neutralising forces of Hindu social action, and in a people frequently subject to famine and starvation, the missionary found an easy field for his prosyletising activities: and the Hindu society was thus being rapidly undermined and disrupted. Lajpat viewed such a situation with concern. Of course, this is not because he is a fanatical Hindu. Far from it, he says: "I am not opposed to the cultivation of a spirit of catholicity among the followers of the different religions that are to be found in this country. By all means carry on your work in

this direction as zealously as you can. I wish you all success. But I cannot persuade myself to believe that it is possible to uproot denominationalism from this land altogether, and for the matter of that, from any land. Our best efforts should then be directed to create a nation in spite of them." "I am not quite sure," he adds, "if it is desirable to do away with religion or with religious denominations altogether even if it were possible to do so. All these differences in religion serve their own purpose in the general economy of the world, and there are a good many people whose views are entitled to the greatest respect from us, who are inclined to think that the world would be poorer and monotonous by the entire removal of these differences." He had a great and abiding faith in Hindu principles and his heart yearned to see that the noble heritage contained in his religion should not be lost to his country by any blindness, ignorance or lack of vision on our part. It was a very common thing in those days to give away orphans and the

starving left guardianless to be taken care of by whomsoever that willed to do so and especially to the foreign missionaries who proselytised these orphans and the breadless and gave them some sort of work to eke out their livelihood. Lajpat Rai wanted to see that Hinduism was not this way undermined and humiliated. He therefore entered upon that noble career of helping the starving, the houseless and the depressed and organised relief works in times of famine and whenever necessary and orphanges under the auspices of the Arya Samaj. As General Secretary of the Arya Samaj orphanage at Ferozepur, the largest Hindu orphanage in India containing many hundreds of orphans inside it, as member of the managing Committee of the waifs' orphanage at Meerut, as the organiser of the Hindu Relief Fund in the great and devastating famines of 1897 and 1899 which gave relief to over 2,000 souls, as the opener of the relief committee to succour the distressed in the great earth-quake at Kangra in 1905, Lala

Lajpat Rai gained great experience as a social worker and earned for him such reputation as a successful worker that the Government invited him to give evidence before the Famine Commission of 1901. Needless to say his evidence was characteristic in emphasising the duty of the State on such occasions to the subjects.

Mr. Rai and social reform.

A close and searching student of the genius of Hinduism, Lajapat Rai, early in his life, was attracted by the eternal truths which Hinduism embodied. His knowledge of Sanskrit only enchanced this passion for his religion. In this sense, in the sense, that is to say, of an ardent admirer of the eternal truths contained in the Vedas, Lajpat Rai may be said to be a revivalist and in no other. He agreed with Mr. Tilak to this extent, but differed from him in holding that we could not, and must not, enforce the decadent caste system now. In the fight in the closing decades of the last century between those whose watchword was

"reform on national lines" and that is to say, those whose watchword was "reform on rational lines," between Tilakites and Ranadeites, Lajpat Rai had no sympathy. To him and his Samaj, the Arya Samaj, "reform is revival and revival is reform. It is true they attach much importance to nationality or to national lines, but subject to the important proviso *that they are not irrational*." In his book, *The United States of America*, he summarises his whole attitude to social reform in these pregnant words: "It is ridiculous to talk of the existence of the case system as a bar to political advancement on the lines of the West; nor does it lie in the mouth of the American missionary in India to talk disparagingly of Hinduism for that reason. This, however, does not justify caste. The rigid caste system we have in India is, without doubt, a social curse and cannot but be denounced in the most unmeasured terms...... The current ideas on caste are not a necessary part of Hinduism or of the Hindu religion. The ancient division was well-suited to the

times and based on fundamentally right ideas. The world has yet to produce a class of high-minded, noble-spirited, self-denying and unselfish leaders of society such as the ancient Brahmins of India were." "The democracies of the West," he continues, "know it to their cost how hard it is to get laws made which would secure them justice and protection against the blood-sucking and soul-killing devices of the capitalist. They have yet to discover that the legislators of a nation should have no interest in property, in business, in trade, in capitalism, or in industries. No comparison could be instituted between the Brahmin legislators of ancient India and the capitalist legislators of the modern world. "Both are liable to fall," he adds. "After centuries of disinterested and pure legislation, the Brahmins fell and misused their power and influence in forging chains of intellectual bondage to the bulk of the nation—but they did not establish a soul-killing industrial system such as the modern industrial Brahmins

of the West have done." Though thus the Lala was not oblivious of the social iniquity of the West, he yet rightly pointed out, democrat in the real sense that he is that, "that does not in any way lessen the paramount duty we educated Indians owe to our society and to our country of removing the obnoxious caste barriers that stand in the way of social consolidation, intellectual progress and political advancement...Hence all honour to those who are engaged in the work, particularly that department of it which concerns the uplift of the depressed classes and the untouchables."

His educational activities.

Early enough in his life, Lala Lajpat Rai had recognised the importance of education in national life; and his experience in connection alike with the social reform movement and famine work only confirmed the great need there was for the expansion of education in the country. As he says in his preface to his latest work* he was

* The Problem of National Education in India.

born of a born teacher. "I owe to him (Lala Munshi Radha Kishen, Lajpat Rai's father, who was by profession a teacher) my interest in education. I have met numerous teachers in my life, but in India I have never come across a better teacher than he. He treated his pupils like comrades and enjoyed their company. He gave the best in him to his pupils, not in a sprit of giving, but in a spirit of co-operation. Wherever he went, he was the idol of his pupils. He never cared how much they remembered of the text, so long as they had an intelligent grasp of the subject he taught. He just helped them learn in their own way. All this was natural to him since not knowing a word of the English language, he never studied the science nor the art (whatever you wish to call it) of teaching." If thus by heredity and influence, education was one of the subjects that naturally interested him, no less was he interested in it by the training and by the duty which he imposed on himself. As he says, "ever since I left school I have been actively

associated with educational movements. My educational activities are known to my countrymen, and I need not mention them in detail. The study of educational institutions, educational ideals and educational methods has been one of the passions of my life. In foreign countries also I have devoted a substantial part of my time and energy to the study of educational questions always with a view to their adaptation to the needs of India." Verily, we know what his educational activities have been. The Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College at Lahore, a first grade college, endowed by him and his friends, which makes of instruction in the Vedas a special feature, is a monument of his educational activities. He was a vice-president of the College and had for years been its Hon. Secretary. His interest in Sanskrit literature is unbounded and he was a Secretary of the Anglo-Sanskrit College at Jullunder. Nor was his interest confined to collegiate education. He was connected with many institutions in the moffussil as member of the managing committee

of the Arya Samaj schools. The Government recognised his interest and experience in education—by the way, it may be mentioned he was on the teaching staff of the Dayanand College as Hon. Lecturer in History—by inviting him to give evidence before the University Commission of 1902 appointed by Lord Curzon's Government.

Ideals and theories of education.

Lala Lajpat Rai's visit to England and America more than once and his study of the educational conditions of the two great democracies and of Japan which also he visited have resulted in his production of a most illuminating book on national education in India*. Indian educationists and those interested in the development of education ought to read this masterly analysis of the educational ideals as they have been developed here and abroad, of educational methods, of educational machinery. The fundamental aim to which all education should

* The Problem of National Education in India.

be directed in the Lala's opinion, we have referred to above. It must be conducive to and it must facilitate, the greatest all-round progress of the people. The Lala, analysing the effects of the war on educational theory, points out how in every civilized country at the present day, the fact is recognised that "the duty of bringing up and educating the child with a view of helping him to become an efficient, intelligent and prudent citizen, rests with the state, and the state must be made to fulfil it."

It is out of place in a sketch like the one in hand to enter upon an exhaustive review of his educational theories and methods, based, as they are, on a most intimate acquaintance with and a searching examination of circumstances and conditions obtaining in other civilized countries, especially Britain, America and Japan; and we are not going to attempt it. We shall be content with pointing out that what he lays much emphasis on is the provision of "a national policy, a national scheme, and a

maximum grant of national funds for the purpose, to be supplemented by Provincial taxes and rates." "Of course," he continues, "the first need of the nation is more schools and more teachers. The second is good schools and good contented teachers. The third is vocational schools, including schools for instruction in commerce and foreign languages. The fourth is technological institutes. The fifth is continuation schools. The sixth is more high schools and more universities." "In my judgment," he adds, "the first ten years of our national effort should be mainly devoted to (a) the increase of literacy; (b) the production of literate, skilled labour, conscious of its rights as human beings, and conscious of its rights as members of the body politic; (c) multiplication and training of the teachers with as great an increase in their remuneration as may be possible under the circumstances." The Lala's programme does not stop with the above. He insists on our other needs also being provided soon. He says; "It should be

the duty of the State to provide higher technological and agricultural institutes in selected localities, in sufficient numbers to enable the nation to develop its mineral, agricultural and industrial resources. It should be the aim of the State to fill up these institutes with Indian expert talent, which, if not forthcoming at once, should be gradually but steadily introduced as competent men, trained in foreign countries as Government Scholars, or otherwise, return." The fact that he devotes two chapters to a consideration of the teaching of patriotism in schools as done in France and in the United States of America shows the importance he attaches to the question. The love of country as a whole, so as to avoid a parochial outlook in its citizens, the love of India as a nation to avoid and prevent the nurture of sectarian antagonism, and an idea of the relations that ought to subsist between the State and the people, now that responsible Government is promised,—these are the subjects he would

include in patriotism lessons. For his elaborate treatment of the theme of physical, vocational and co-operative education, we must request readers to go to his book in which he has so exhaustively and so interestingly dealt with the questions.

Mr. Rai and industrial development.

Lala Lajpat Rai's interest in industrial development was only a little less marked than that in education. He was for long a director of The Panjab National Bank, one of the greatest and the most sound of indigenous banking institutions in the country with branches in all the big cities of Upper India and Bombay, and one which survived the banking crisis of 1913. More than that, he was connected with many cotton mills and cotton presses in the Panjab, having been a director of many of these institutions. In this field of public activities, it is true he yields the palm to his compatriot Lala Harkishen Lal, but he did so only because he felt that his activities elsewhere of other kinds

will be proportionately more fruitful of good results. He had a staunch faith in the Swadeshi movement and he spoke and wrote on it more than once. "Speaking for myself," he said, "I am an out and out Swadeshist and have been so for the last 25 years, in fact ever since I learnt for the first time the true meaning of the word patriotism. For me the words '*Swadeshi*' *and* '*patriotism*' *are synonymous*...I am personally inclined to attach the greatest importance possible to the Swadeshi movement. I look upon it as *the* remedy upon the right and continued use of which depends the alleviation of the sufferings of our country. I *regard it as the salvation of my country*....The Swadeshi ought to teach us how to organise our capital, our resources, our labour, our energies and our talents to the greatest good of all Indians. I want a better understanding of the economic needs and requirements of our country and a practical programme of industrial development based on scientific calculations." It is significant of his passion for industrial

development and his interest in scientific calculations and survey of industrial conditions that wherever he went, whatever countries he visited, he did not fail to note the success or failure of the industrial system of those countries with a study and examination of the causes which led to such success or failure. We have got such a study of Japan's industrial development in his recent book. *The Evolution of Japan and Other Papers*, wherein he comes to the conclusion that the industrial development of Japan in the last fifty years is due to the support which such development met with at the hands of the Government. In that book, he shows that under each head of the requisites of industrial development and in each case "the initiative came from the Government and the Government bore all the initial losses and expenses in connection therewith. It should be kept in mind that for 25 years or more of these fifty years Japan laboured in face of international treaties which denied her freedom of action in regulating her

tariff." "Japan," he says elsewhere, "is a splendid example of what can be achieved by a nation guided by a benevolent national government devoted to her people."

His political life.

Surely, then, the development of her industries would be greatly advanced if India had a national Government. The feeling was there in Mr. Lajpat Rai's mind from his very early days, going back even to his college days: and his vast experience of the affairs in other countries only deepened this feeling. It is a tribute to his strong individuality of character that in this respect he boldly differed from his friend and senior Lala Hansraj, just as he differed from Tilak and Ranade in regard to social reform. Hansraj's outlook was limited to the accomplishment of social reform and the carrying on of social work. He was too much impressed with the vast extent of that field to allow his attention to be distracted by other activities. The harmony of all-round

social development, the need for and the advantage of its simultaneity, the parallel advancement of the country in economic as well as in social, in political as well as in religious matters—which we saw which was the principle which guided all the activities of Lala Lajpat Rai—these were things beyond the range of vision of the elder patriot. Lajpat Rai, with the independence characteristic of him, stuck to his own views, and as early as 1888 joined the Indian National Congress which met at Allahabad under the presidency of George Yule. Since that date, till the time when circumstances forced him out of it, he worked under and for the Congress Flag with as much assiduity, as much clearness of vision, as much enthusiasm and as much earnestness, with which he served the Arya Samaj flag. All these years he was a moving spirit at its meetings, and outside them, he often spoke, wrote and fought on its behalf. He is the author of some of the masterly addresses ever delivered at a Congress

pandal and his speech in support of a resolution "on repressive measures" at the Benares Congress presided over by Mr. Gokhale is regarded as a model of manly and dignified eloquence, as forceful as it was effective. The Congress honoured his services and recognised his abilities by selecting him to go on a deputation to England along with Mr. Gokhale. It is characteristic of the man that though the Lahore Indian Association voted Rs. 3,000 to cover his expenses as a delegate, he did not utilise the sum for the purpose, but disbursed it for struggling students and others in great need of it. His own touring expenses he incurred from his own pocket. It is equally characteristic of him that to the displeasure of some of his friends, he took up an attitude at the Surat Congress and at an earlier session of the Congress which favoured Tilak's views rather than those of his Moderate friends: but although with Tilak and Pal, he opposed Mendicancy tooth and nail, it cannot be said that he was in the usual sense of the term a

party politician for reasons which we have hinted at above.

His political methods.

What, then, are his aims in politics? What his methods? These questions remain to be answered. When Naoroji declared at the Calcutta Congress that the goal of Indian politicians was Swaraj, Lajpat Rai observed : "In a happy and inspired moment, Mr. Naoroji struck upon that noble word 'Swaraj', which sums up all our political aspirations. Henceforth, 'Swaraj' is our war-cry, our all-inspiring and all absorbing aim in life. Henceforth, the duty of our earthly existence should be to forget self in this aim prescribed for us by the exigencies of the times and accepted by us after consideration of all the pros and cons." "This polestar in the firmament of Indian Nationalism" having thus been determined, how are we to realise our aims? Not by Mendicancy, not by political opportunism masquerading as patriotism, the parasitic weeds which suck the blood

out of true patriotism. We must, according to this great patriot, first clear our minds of cant and mercilessly expose and wage war on pseudo-patriots and self-seeking opportunists. Undaunted manliness, sterling purity of purpose, faith in the great cause, unbending patriotism, absolute disinterestedness, a spirit of ready self-sacrifice—these are the qualities which the Lala wants of the workers, and it is able men with such qualities that the Lala sought to bring into public life after having given them special, suitable training. Lajpat is never tired of pointing out, by example as well as by precept, more by example than by precept, the great need there is for self-sacrifice in the country. "These are the times," he said, in the course of an article on the then situation a decade ago, "that try men's souls. The sun-shine soldier and the sun-shine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands to it now, deserves the thanks of man and woman. Tyranny like hell is not easily conquered; yet we have this

consolation with us, that the harder the contest, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheaply, we esteem too lightly; it is dearnesss only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to set a proper price upon its goods; and it would have been strange if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated."

Opposition—Mendicant and Opportunist.

He did not underrate the force of opposition that there will be to this his programme. "That the opposition of the dominant race will be tremendous and terrible, I readily grant; but what I fear most," he continued, "is the opposition from within, the opposition of the classes enjoying the special patronage of the Government, the opposition of interest, the opposition of privilege, and last but not least, the opposition of timidity and cowardice." How prophetic these words in the light of recent events, how truly in accord with facts! Mr. Lajpat Rai recognised that this did

not complete the category of our oppositionists. There still remained the insidious, embarassing, opposition of parasitic opportunists. These persons, he said, are even more dangerous than the mere scoffer and the cynic. And who exactly are these people? We shall allow Mr. Rai to describe them in his own inimitable words. "They are those," he says, "who insist to be of you, and with you, but whose heart is not with you, and whose interests understood by them, lies the other way. Although they are apt to betray themselves at every other step, they cover their shame by ridiculing the zealous and the earnest, by quietly and philosophically questioning their motives and by poisoning the minds of others against them. Their attitude undergoes no change whether the reform advocated is religious, social or political. The first bores them as affectation of the brain; the second annoys them as tending towards puritanism and misanthropy; the third frightens them." "The beauty of the whole thing, however, is,"

continues the keen observer that he is, "the fact that large numbers of them cannot help poking their noses everywhere. They enlist as members of societies whose proposed object is to preach religion. They display great interest in social reform so long as it does not interfere with what they call the joys of life.... As for political association, these are their special hunting grounds. They have no objection to preside at public meetings or to move or second resolutions or to attend Conferences and Congresses, if it suits their convenience or is likely to be profitable, but all the same they will continue to revel in scoffing at and laughing down those who are serious and earnest about the matter." These oppositionists, in his opinion, could be checkmated only by earnest and persistent propaganda among the masses through well-trained and well-equipped political sanyasins of irreproachable character. It is worthy of note that while maturitey in most politicians—even Tilak is not excepted by some from this tendency—

leads to mendicancy, Lajpat Rai stands out as bold as ever and sticks to his guns. No clean political weapon, provided it is constitutional, does he refuse to take advantage of, not excluding the latest weapon, Non-Co-operation. His views on the question is too important to be dismissed in a line and we therefore give them elsewhere in his own words.

Mr. Lajbat Rai and propaganda.

Indeed, one of Mr. Lajpat Rai's claim to glory is this his realisation of the need for active and vigorous political propaganda among the masses. It is to be deplored that his scheme for the training up and sending out of political missionaries made little headway and that what made headway, the Servants of India Society, is more and more showing a tendency to become, if it has not already become, a social service organisation, pure and simple. Tilak realised the need for it on an All-India scale too late in his life for that realisation to fructify into a living, continuous organisa-

tion. So was his realisation of the need for propaganda in foreign countries. In this respect, however, Mr. Rai's foresight has proved itself superior to that of other Indian patriots. Just immediately after his return from England in 1905, Lajpat Rai recognised and pointed out what we have only now realised that the only party in England with which we could profitably ally ourselves was the Labour Party. As early did he recognise what Tilak did but a year or two ago, that the Indian political freedom could best be won by conducting Indian propaganda in America and the European countries and thus gaining international sympathy for India. His priceless work in this behalf in America in the last six years has won for him universal gratitude and a splendid tribute from Mr. Tilak, on behalf of the nation. Mr. Rai has established there the India Home Rule League which keeps the great democracy of the West interested in us and, through it, the world at large. His journal *Young India* widely circulates in America.

The India information Bureau established by him is an energetic and enthusiastic agency which disseminates Indian political and other literature very widely and keeps the Indian public informed of the movement of affairs in the West through their news service to the Indian Press.

Hindu—Muslim Unity and Turkey.

No study of Mr. Lajpat Rai can afford to omit to indicate his views on the burning topics of the day such as the Hindu—Muslim unity, the Turkish Peace Treaty, and Non-Co-operation. In his early days, it may be contended by some perhaps that he was a violent sectarian, a far too faithful guardian of the Hindu faith to care very much for the fates of other faiths. That would however be a cruel mistake. We have shown how he was not opposed to the progress of other faiths in all legitimate manner. Lest, however, there should be lurking any suspicion still in the minds of any that he was not keen on the interests of his

brethren of other communities, we shall set down here what he said on the Hindu—Muslim unity in reply to the welcome address presented to him on his return from America six months ago. "My friends," he said, "I must tell you that henceforth we should recognise it as a fundamental doctrine that the unity of the Hindus and Mahammadans will be a great asset to our political future. In this unity we shall not be guided by the temporary benefit of this community or that. We shall not adopt it as a measure of political expediency. But we shall adopt it as a fundamental doctrine of our faith to stick to our death-beds until we win our freedom. Not till then only, but thereafter too, we shall live in this country as brothers determined to work together, determined to resist together, and determined to win. That is one of the fundamental doctrines which we must adopt as a first article of our political faith." It was not merely from this point of view that Mr. Lajpat Rai supported the Indian Muslims

in their attempt to get the Khilafat wrong redressed. "English statesmen object to the interference of Indian Muhammadans in the affairs of the Turkish Empire. India should," he said, "emphatically record a protest against that view. Turkey was defeated mainly by the Indian Army, for which India paid. That fact alone gives every Indian, Hindu or Muhammadan or Buddhist, a right to be heard in the Turkish settlement." "Any settlement of the affairs of Turkey," he continued, "based on purely Imperial considerations or from the point of view of European nations, is bound to lead to war in the Near East, and war in the East means heavy military expenditure. The military dragoon is already sucking our blood profusely.........Looked at from that point of view, the Turkish question is an Indian affair, and must receive our best attention. Even if there were no Muhammadans in India we would be vitally interested in the problem, a wrong solution of which is likely to involve us in heavy military ex-

penditure which can be incurred only by starving all these departments of national life upon which progress depends." Lajpat Rai felt so strongly on the point that he was not for burking the question with expressing lip sympathy with our Muslim friends. It was his considered view that a Turkish settlement unfavourable to Indian Muslim views was a danger to India otherwise than from the point of view purely of a financier. "It is a national duty to focus and consolidate Indian opinion on the Turkish question and to press it on the British people for consideration. It is not a question," he said, "that affects Muhammadans only. It is one that affects every Asiatic and every Indian, nay every human being. Do we want an extension of the war, or do we want peace? Lord Curzon forecasts an extended war in Asia, and this may be taken as a certainty if the Turkish question is not settled satisfactorily." This, it will be recognised, is a far-seeing, statesmanlike, vigorous, home-thrust on British policy in the Near and the Middle East; and but for the

bankruptcy of statesmanship in Britain just at present, this advice would have been heeded to. Unfortunately for us, and for the Empire for the matter of that, British policy is now in the hands of Tory Junkers whose foreign policy is along the path through which Economic Imperialism leads them, certainly not, as they will ere long discover if they still persist in it, a very safe or sound or peaceful policy. *Hinc illae lachrymae.*

India's Status among the Nations.

Lala Lajpat Rai had unbounded faith in his countrymen and in his country's high destiny. And he has not failed to express this faith. Years ago he powerfully chided his countrymen for their lack of faith in their own capacity. He repeated that charge six months ago at Bombay, but of course with the improvement that has taken place in the tone of public life in this country, he had not to be as hard on them this time as he was more than ten years ago. "I must tell you," so he said addressing his

countrymen in Bombay, "do not place any faith upon anybody but yourself. You can rise only by your own efforts. Remember 'Nations are by themselves made." "We shall welcome co-operation," he continued. "We shall welcome advice. We shall welcome guidance also in certain matters. But we shall resent patronage and dictation. We are not babies. We have behind us the grown wisdom of six thousand years at our back at least, not to say more." Lajpat Rai's peculiar, intimate knowledge of the conditions in the great democracies of the West and in the equally great democracies of the East, peculiarly qualifies him to give a comparative idea of the possibilities of the democratic government in these countries and in India. And he has taken it as his life-long mission almost to make such comparative studies. And what are the results of those studies? We shall summarise them in his own words. "I may tell you," he said to the Bombay audience, "I have travelled now practically all over the

world and I have seen three of the great self-ruling nations of the world at least, the Japanese, the Americans, and the Englishmen. And take it from me, that except perhaps in the requirements of modern knowledge, we are inferior to none of the earth. I shall if I have time take you department by department and show you that in no department of associated life, or private life, are we inferior to any nation in the world." "What are we inferior in?", continued the Lala. "We have been inferior in the capacity to unite, we have been inferior to a certain extent in adaptation to the modern requirements, we have been inferior in learning the lesson of modern diplomacy. Therein lies our inferiority. If we had learnt the art of telling lies on a broad scale, if we had swept away all our past and entered into the great arena of violence, if we had done all these things which at the present moment represent power in the world, we might have been considered by the great nations of the world as worthy of self-govern-

ment." How true these words are only those who know India intimately can know.

Lajpat Rai and the Empire.

There is one episode in Lajpat Rai's life, glorious to his countrymen but unpleasant to Government, on which we have not hitherto touched, but which reveals what sort of a man he is. Lajpat Rai in the dark days of 1907–08 was suspected of being engaged in a seditious conspiracy and was deported! It was not without the range of possibility altogether for the Lala to have purchased his freedom at the cost of a few words perhaps of apology or repentence, but unbending patriot that he was, he boldly explained his position and, refusing to lead a life of ignoble ease, preferred irksome exile to it. Sometime later the Government's eyes were opened and they were rid of their suspicions of him. The widespread and intense indignation that this action of Lord Minto's Government roused in the people was at once a tribute to the Lala's patriotism and an eye-opener to Government as to the

immense and legitimate hold he had over his countrymen. But this very cause coupled with his very frank expression of opinion which wounded the suceptibilities of the bureaucracy constituted an unpardonable offence in the eyes of the bureaucrats and he has ever been in their bad books. Wherever he went, whatever activities he engaged himself in, the intelligence agents of these men dogged his steps and crossed his paths, of course to little purpose. To seek to detect nefarious conduct in an open-hearted, frank, honourable critic is to seek to get water out of stone ; and his enemies in Britain as well as in India had to be content with a cowardly aspersion on his character by the ill-informed British Home Secretary of the day, Sir George Cave, a year and more ago—an aspersion which was coupled by the significant statement that nothing wrong was known to have been done by him. Attempts were made to see that he was not allowed to go to India from America, but as repeated secret enquiries and searches of his offices and his

papers failed to cast any doubt on his character, he was at last permitted to go to his own country! Lajpat Rai never kow-towed to the tin gods of India. He openly stated years ago that our loyalty was, in a sense, conditional; his view was, there must be something given us by Britain for us to be loyal for. He forcefully criticised an educational authority's circular calling upon schools to inculcate loyalty to the Empire, because such loyalty at the time was incompatible with patriotism. Now that responsible Government has been promised, he has shown willingness in his latest book* to inculcate the Imperial Idea in our schools, for, that is no longer incompatible with patriotism. The latter fact is sufficient to show that he is not only a patriot, but a loyal patriot at that.

Conclusion.

Such, then, is in brief the record of the great patriot on whom we have bestowed, to use the common *cliche*, the highest honour that is in our power to bestow on those whom we recognise as

* The Problem of National education in India.

great patriots. The record, needless to say, is incomplete; it has altogether left out of account, to mention but one thing, his great activities as a journalist and as an author. His *Open Letters* to Sir Syed Ahmad Khan were marked by qualities which will bear comparison with those of *The Letters of Junius*. *The Political Future of India*, a publication which has just reached India, is an illuminating commentary by the Lala on all the topics that agitate the public mind to-day—the reform Act, Industrial Commission Report, the Rowlatt Report and so on, based as it is, on an intimate comparative knowledge of the political conditions obtaining in three continents. The writer and the publishers, however, have been precluded by the very nature of the present publication from entering at length on these activities. They have had to confine themselves to pointing out and emphasising the inspiring qualities of his partiotic genius. They will be more than satisfied if this their limited object is fulfilled by this publication.

Patriotism.—The Mission of Life.*

It is but natural for every man to possess feelings of love; but love is of two kinds, selfish, having the achievement of immediate gain in view, and unselfish—which impels us on to do works of public utility with more or less depending on the extent of the feelings of selfless motives

Selfish love cannot, however, make our minds peaceful or calm the inner cravings of man for blissfulness; for the attainment of this end we must all needs do some selfless work. No country can prosper until her sons and daughters are imbued with a genuine sense of unselfish devotion towards her and ready to subordinate their personal interests for country's good.

The Japanese have recently shown to what lofty heights patriotic fervour can rise. A mother's stabbing herself in order to free her son from the burden of her maintenance so that he may go to war and die for her beloved country and the readiness of an overwhelmingly large number of sailors to drown themselves with ships in front of Port Arthur are instances which nothing short of a deep love for

* Speech at Ambala.

country's honor—much less lust for gold or glorification of vain self—can prompt. Even in European countries, with their long legend of national patriotism, such examples of sublime devotion are rare.

A degenerate country, like ours, badly needs for her service such selfless workers as neither wealth nor power could buy. We had a large number of them in our glorious past when our country's towering moral and physical capabilities had elevated it to the lofty pinnacle of prosperity and happiness.

Not long ago all our requirements were met with by articles of *deshi* manufacture. Woe, however, to our present situation of helpless dependence on foreigners, who drain away most part of the money earned by us with the sweat of our brow. And this drain is responsible for the oft-recurring famines and pestilence, which mainly victimise the poor owing to the unhealthy state of their habitations and their inability to get sufficient and wholesome food. Lord Curzon's government estimated that the Indian's average income then was Rs. 30 per annum or 2-8 a month. When this is the average there must be many who live on Rs. 1-8 or, even, Re. 1 a month. It is a mystery how a man can even parsimoniously feed

and clothe himself for a month on this paltry income unless he half starves.

As a matter of fact there are seven crores of men who get only one meal in a day and there are many more who live on roots and barks of trees. About forty to fifty thousand are devoured by plague and other diseases every week. Any country having such a horrible and heartrending tale of sorrow and devastation can never have a hopeful future. Europeans are living comfortably. The reason is that they are true to their country, following *Swadeshi* in its true essence. Plague and pestilence do not touch them because they live in commodious, well-ventilated houses in the healthiest parts of the towns. They carry most of our corn to their country—even when our own men are starving for want of food and famines are fiercely raging in the land—for maintaining an adequate supply of staple food for their own countrymen. Our raw products find their way to England in order to develop her trade in manufactured articles, which are brought back and sold in India at enormous profits. They do not scruple to provide lucrative employments for their own men in this country and are always ready to do everything that is

calculated to promote their people's welfare. This genuine regard for providing for the good of their whole community is the secret of their prosperity and success all round.

Our countrymen sadly lack in that spirit of patriotism that characterises the citizens of every great and prosperous country in the world and consequently there is no end to our troubles. Nothing short of true *desh bhakti*, which consists in sacrificing the hankering after pelf and power in favour of the unremunerative yet—important and divine—task of working for the welfare of our countrymen,—can save us from the death and destruction that is staring us in the face. Genuine and selfless devotion (*Bhakti*) for our *desh* ought to be the dharma, the noble mission of life, of every one of us and in the service of our country we should spare neither money nor life.

What India wants

A SENSE OF PUBLIC DUTY AND A HIGH STANDARD OF PUBLIC MORALITY

A question has often haunted us, asleep or awake, as to why is it that notwithstanding the presence amongst us of great vigorous and elevating religious truths, and of the very highest conception of morality, we have been a subject race, held down for so many centuries by sets of people who were neither physically nor spritually nor even intellectually so superior to us as *a fortiori* to demand our subjection.

We do not require a Herbert Spencer to tell us that the social efficiency of a social organism as such, depends upon the sense of social responsibility amongst the members of such an organism. The greater and the intenser the sense of responsibility amongst the individual members, regarding the safety and the welfare of the whole, the greater and the stronger the efficiency of the organism.

It is precisely this sense which is wanting in us and which stands in our way as a nation. Physically we are the equals of any people on earth.

Barring those high class Hindus who think their glory consists in weak constitutions, delicate limbs and womanly features or who are given to determine their position in society by the amount of fat on their body and by the amount of physical inactivity which attends their business in life, the majority of our countrymen possess fine physiques and are able to withstand any amount of hardship and struggle. Even with the little they get to satisfy their animal wants, with their coarse food, scanty clothing and ill-ventilated and excessively crowded homesteads they produce a soldiery which ranks amongst the best in the world. Whether it be the Rajput, the Jat, the Sikh, the Gurkha, the Punjabi, the Mahratta, or the Punjabi Mussulman the view expressed above holds equally good in the case of all. All of them have by turns, earned the highest praises of military experts under whom they had occasion to serve beneath the British flag. Whatever may be said of the many mistakes of head and heart by which they lost their own battles before the advent of the British, no one can question their bravery and valour. History is full of their deeds. Intellectually too, given the opportunities, the sons of India have given no occasion to shame their mother country. The Hindu civilization, the Budhistic

achievements are standing monuments of their high intellectual calibre. Under Mohammadan rule as well, when according to the celebrated Alberuni, the elite of the Hindu community sought the safety of the remotest and the farthest parts of the country to be secure from the molestation of the fanatically disposed Mohammadans, the country continued to produce intellectual giants whose names still shed luster on the country of their birth. Under the British, too, with the few opportunities that are possessed by the Indian scholar to distinguish himself, the country has produced a Bose, a Ramchandra, a Paranjpe, a Ranade, and many others whose names are the common property of all Indians. Then if we look to the domain of religion we stand almost unequalled. What other country in Europe can show the equals of the unknown authors of the Upanishads, Buddha, and Shankracharya? From religion if we come down to the regions of philosophy, where in one country could we found such a galaxy of truth loving, honest and bold thinkers, as the immortal authors of the six Darshanas, and some of their commentators and elucidators? Again, glancing at the history of chivalry and noble deeds, does not the history of the Rajputs read like a romance? Why then, are we so low in the scale

of nations? What is it that keeps us down and does not allow us to raise our head above the waters? We are not wanting in flexibility or adaptability. Where on earth will you find another case parallel to Hinduism? Notwithstanding 12 centuries of Islamic propaganda backed by all the forces of political ascendancy and of that moral superiority which is the ancher sheet of a virgin religion and a conquering creed; notwithstanding again of 100 years of active evangelical work done in the name of Christ by devoted Missionaries, Hinduism still reigns supreme in the land and baffles all attempts made from time to time, to displace and overthrow it. How is it then, that with all the education we have received during the one century of British rule, with frantic profession of patriotism that are the natural result of a knowledge of our degradation and helplessness, with wild cries of nationality in danger, with pathetic appeals for reforms in the administration of the country, we have so far failed to gain anything substantial in our quest after national liberty? How is it that our cries make no impression, our appeals go unheeded and our profession turn to be of no avail? While sparing no occasion or means of criticising Government measures, very often offering right and sensible criticism,

with that amount of persistency which sometimes we show, we are yet powerless to obtain even the smallest measure of reform either in constitution or in administration, or even of remedial justice? Why leaving the political sphere aside, how is it that even in matters of social reform which being in our hands no Government prevents us from giving effect to, we have so far failed to achieve that amount of success which the Herculean efforts of men like Ram Mohan Rai, Dayanand Saraswati, Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar and Madadeva Gobind Ranade deserved? The reply is the same as we have already given above. We are individually wanting in that sense of social responsibility which requires each ànd every member of the organism to place the interests of the community or the nation over and above those of his own. Amongst us selfishness, greed and calculation reign supreme. Most of us cannot even think of the society or the community or the nation. But even those who can think and do profess to care for them do not care a farthing for the same, when their own individual interests seem to clash with the interests of the society. Most of us, including some of the very highly educated men, who do not fail to exhibit often an unpardonable pride in the amount of

learning locked in their brains who very readily spend hours in finding fault with the commas and semicolons of less gifted brethren, who do not fail to parade their knowledge of the philosophy of Herbert Spencer, of the Science of Huxley or of the fine poetic genius of a Shelley or a Tennyson are utterly devoid of a sense of social responsibility.

We know that men who denounced the institution of child marriage in the vehement language they could command, were at the same time conscious of the fact that they had themselves already fixed a date for the marriage of their seven years aged girl with a boy of a similarly tender age. We have known men whose professions of patriotism were often the most profuse giving a point blank refusal to any demand of help for any national institution. We have known of great *patriots* rolling in wealth, possessing palatial residences, enjoying the blessing of a good fixed income, never moving their finger to reduce misery that was next door to them. We have seen great *patriotic* Indians passing by in a spirit of perfect indifference, when another countryman of theirs was being cruelly beaten by an European. No Indian is supposed to make any move unless such move pays or benefits him in cash.

or in kind in any way. If you go to a gentleman to ask him to join such and such an association or to do such and such a thing, the question that he puts to you or if he has not the courage to do so openly to himself, is what shall he gain thereby? We know that people give subscriptions, attend meetings, join Associations and Samajes and do a lot of other things that have the look of public spirit or national help but how many of them, may we ask except when moved by religion, do so by a sense of public duty and individual responsibility for the national cause? It is very unpleasant to speak ill of one's own countrymen or to appear to be ungrateful to those estimable gentlemen who do keep public movements going but to be truthful we shall be failing in our duty if we were to pretend a belief in their patriotism. It is our firm belief that if the country could have claimed the one tenth part of that patriotism which is often paraded and assumed, the state of things would have been different and no Government could have ignored the existence or the demands of such patriotism. But the facts are otherwise; not that the social ideals taught by our religion are low and mean, not that this rank selfishness and base calculation of self interest is countenanced by the teachings of our great men, not that this sense

of national and public duty is entirely absent from the teachings of our Shastras. No. Political degradation for so long as practically extinguished the very germs of this noble sentiment from our blood. Our immediate ancestors did not possess it, so we could not inherit it from them. As for its inculcation from without we are sorry that the advantages of Western culture have not been unmixed. While very few have imbibed its noble sentiments, a large number have taken and adopted in life its materialistic tendencies. We know that we require the latter, too, rather badly but we cannot forget, that, if we once allow ourselves to be possessed of these only without the other necessary and counteracting tendencies, we are done for. The country may grow rich, it may extend its commerce, it might even begin to manufacture for other countries ; but unless all this is accompanied by a sense of public duty in the people of this country, all this will not avail us, nay, might be the very foundation of future fall, if further fall is yet possible. Yes, we want all this, but first and foremost of all we want the habit and sense of subordinating our individual interests to end before the interests of the community at large. In short, what we pre-eminently want is that every Indian may be sufficiently patriotic and

dutiful to believe and act up to the belief that the interests of the country are paramount and must override all private considerations. We want this to be regularly taught as the highest religion that will bring about the salvation of India. To promulgate this we want faithful and true preachers who may be living examples of the truth of their propaganda and who can show the power of their faith in their own persons. Let each province produce a number of such preachers and we are convinced that patriotism will gain firm ground in the country and the cause of nationality will advance with leaps and bounds. Without this we may go on crying for decades and decades but we shall not advance an inch.

A fight for crumbs

One of the biggest evils of an alien rule is the tendency for dependence that it creates in the subject people, which naturally leads to divisions and differences over the distribution of crumbs, which fall from the master's table. When Lord Morley introduced his reforms in 1909 he planned to crush the advanced nationalists by taking the moderates under his wings. He gave a few posts to the latter, and gave a few others the opportunity of prefixing "honorable" to their names. Now Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford are playing the same game. Be it said to their credit, however, that they are doing it in a more masterly way than Lord Morley ever did. Morley was lacking in courage. Having been a theorist all his life he knew how to write, but had not the courage to put his principles into practice. Master of words, he was not quite a success as a doer of deeds. His statesmanship, if one may call it such, was devoid of faith as well as of imagination. Montagu, however, is in certain respects rising to the heights of statesmanship. But even he has to go slow and haltingly. He cannot defy vested

interests, nor ignore the Junker element in Parliament and the country. Yet, in twelve months he has done more in the way of rallying the moderates than Morley did in five years. He has been giving appointment after appointment to the Moderates and has completely won them over to his side. Perhaps the war created the occasion. Besides, he has the support of the Viceroy as well as the advantage of world changes in his favor. Yet making due allowance for these, one cannot but put him above Morley in his attempt to effect far-reaching reforms in the administration of India. This, however, is only by the way.

We had started by commenting on the fight for crumbs which is the natural result of an alien rule. We find it fully illustrated in the present political struggle that is proceeding in India. In Lord Morley's time the Indian Nationalists were divided into two classes, the so-called Moderates and the so-called Extremists. Now it is said that there are four—Moderates and Ultra-Moderates, Extremists and Ultra-Extremists. We have been carefully studying the pronouncements of all and anxiously watching the developments. The splits and differences and recriminations do not frighten us. In fact,

they add to our spirits. Heat indicates life. Friction is not *always* bad. Peace at any price is not always good. *Life is the real thing, and not peace and quiet.* We have been taught to love peace and quiet more than life, and that has brought about our downfall. The differences in the Nationalist camp indicate active thought, active life and struggle. We are happy over this indication. But we have to guard against their not being turned to destructive ends.

What makes us feel sorry is that so much feeling should be injected into matters which ought to be discussed on broad lines. We are more angry with the Moderates for the simple reason that they make such exaggerated claims for patience, experience, sobriety, statesmanship, past services and sacrifices, and yet are the loudest in denunciation and in shedding tears We have many friends among them whom we revere and love and for whom we have the highest respect. We have absolutely no doubt of their sincerity, honesty and patriotism, but we cannot concede that they have the monopoly of these, or even of wisdom and sagacity. What perplexes us even more is that we cannot see any very radical differences between the respective political aspirations of the various parties. Of course, differences

there are, but are they so material as to justify all the heat and passion that is being introduced into the discussions over the Reform Scheme? Do they deserve all the froth and foam that is being generated on both sides? Why have the Moderates seceded from the Congress? Why could they not stay in as a minority, even for a year? The so-called Extremists have been in a minority for years.

Reverting to the Reform Scheme, we notice a substantial agreement that the Government Scheme is not satisfactory, and that it lacks essentials. All parties contend that it concedes practically no power to the people in the Central Government, and in that respect is very defective. All insist that it must be modified on certain definite lines, giving almost the same power to the elected representatives of the people in the Central Government as is conceded in the provincial governments. The quarrel is mainly over words and details. One party calls the scheme "unsatisfactory and disappointing." The Moderates object to the use of these words. They do not want a definite period being fixed for the grant of full home rule while the other factor demands it. One party is satisfied with the scheme for the Provincial Governments, the other party demands full

autonomy in all the provinces. The Moderate legislators in Bengal and Bombay and the United Provinces have in their official capacities demanded full autonomy for their respective provinces. The so-called Extremists demand it for all.

The Moderates are afraid lest too much criticism of the scheme might endanger it altogether. The opposition in England has unbalanced them. They forget that what is conceded is not being given as a matter of favour, but *because it is impossible to govern India on old lines*; and because it is a *necessity of the times*, imposed by the progress of the world and the rapid strides that have taken place in the ideas of men and women about the functions of governments. They are still quoting the old, time-worn maxims about representative government and political democracy. They have not yet awakened to the consciousness that the old political masters are intellectually effete and dead. Their theories have been superseded by newer ones which are holding the mind of the world in their grip. The world no longer swears by the words of Mill, Morley, Burke and Bryce or others of the old Liberal school. They are interesting land marks on the highway of human thought, but no more the dispensers of light

and the givers of hope. The world has advanced beyond the points covered by their geniuses.

The Montague scheme cannot fail, because it is a necessity of the times. But even if it does fail, its failure will be no calamity. Its failure will leave two alternative courses open to the masters of India; either to introduce a better and more democratic scheme or to start an active policy of extended repression and suppression. We are not at all afraid of the latter, as there is nothing which gives vigor to a movement for liberty, as repression and suppression. Liberty delayed takes its vengeance on those who delay it. See Russia, Germany and Turkey. The British are too wise to indulge in that. They will concede as well as repress. There is very little danger, then, of Mr. Montagu's scheme failing altogether. It is a policy of reform and repression. The Extremists again are childish in demanding a time limit for the grant of full home rule, forgetting that the authority which fixes the time limit can cancel it later on. We *shall* get it when we deserve it.

Both parties forget that it is not in the nature of Governments to concede more than is absolutely necessary to be conceded, in the interest of their own

safety. In fact, Governments give the appearance of concession to what has really been won by the people. Judged in this light, the political leaders of India are fighting over crumbs. To us, sitting at a distance, they seem to be devoid of vision and lacking in firmness of principle. They are afraid of ghosts and what frightens them is not the strength of the Government but their own weakness. They have no faith in themselves. Some of them have been arm-chair politicians writing mostly for profit and gain, occasionally giving a tiny fraction of their income in subscriptions; or practising law and making millions out of the wretched pittances which the vast bulk of their countrymen make to remove their hunger. They have always felt for the masses and have expressed their feelings in touching, sincere language but they have done precious little to share what they possess or have possessed with the masses. Between them and the masses there is a gulf which they have never tried to bridge. They live in palaces while the masses have not even huts to live in. Most of them are Sirs or *Rai Bahadurs* or *Khan Bahadurs*. They are proud of these titles. Their champions in the Press always give a string of "Sirs" in support of their political views. Too much authority, blind authority, mere authority,

whether that of the Prince or the priest, of the Raja or the Nabob, of the oligarch or the official, of the wealthy and the prosperous is the bane of Indian life, yet these stalwarts of reform always take shelter behind big names. Their chief argument is to be found in Who's Who, and if the people who are with them are so many Sirs, so many Honorables, so many Rajas and Nabobs, their argument is conclusive. They are mortally afraid of saying or doing things which may offend the Government officials. Even in the selection of their officers, in the nominating of their leaders, they do not look to fitness and courage, but seek out the men who are more likely to be acceptable to the authorities. In their management .of the Indian National Congress, they have never hesitated to resort to caucus methods, to underhand intrigues*, to canvassing, to filling meetings with their adherents and so on. They are well conversant with the so-called election methods of the Western democracies. Yet they get angry when the same methods are used by their rivals. Now that the Congress has fallen into the hands of the other party, they are calling to the Heavens to witness the calamity. They have wrecked the

* As an illustration of their methods we may refer to the Congresses of 1906, 1907, 1914.

Congress, says "the Leader." The Congress was "wrecked" the minute the Moderates left it. The Delhi Session has only registered a *fait accompli.* Their opponents they run down as "youngsters," "demagogues," "inexperienced" "rash," firebrands," and so on. The people they call "mobocracy." Anything disagreeable to them is immoral. Anything distasteful to them is crass stupidity. All the epithets which their erstwhile enemies and their present admirers in the Anglo-Indian press once used against them they are now employing against such of their countrymen as do not follow their lead and will not recognize their authority. In a minority, they desire to rule the majority, even more autocratically than they did when they had a majority.

The Moderate papers are making great fuss over the fact of some of the old and the most respected leaders being on their side. Time after time they recall the names of——, filling columns with stories of their sacrifices. We have nothing but respect for these gentlemen, and admiration for their services. Nor do we deny that whatever they say should be heard with respect and attention. They are among the makers and moulders of Modern India and the country owes them gratitude. But if, after

giving them a full and respectful hearing the country thinks differently, it is fully entitled to disregard their advice and go its own way.

A leader is one whose leadership satisfies and is effective, one who is always ahead of those whom he seeks to lead, who is fearless and courageous and, above all, whose disinterestedness is above suspicion. He remains a leader so long as he maintains these qualities. *Once a leader is not always a leader. Leadership in a progressive community changes with the times and circumstances**. It does not depend on age or learning; nor on titles and diplomas. Sometimes it is the duty of a leader to restrain, to check, and to warn, but the task becomes impossible if he allows his own thought to fall behind that of his erstwhile followers. In that case his warnings go unheeded and his attempt to restrain assumes the appearance of tyranny and leads to his fall. A leader who puts his own past services and sacrifices in the forefront of his arguments for a particular course of action puts himself in an awkward and somewhat ridiculous position, especially when his

---

* Read the history of the various democratic movements in Europe and America. Read the biographies of Parnell and Redmond, Bryan and Roosevelt, Kropotkin and Madame Breshkovskaya.

followers find that, comparing his present stand with the opinions expressed by him in the immediate past, he seems to have gone back on his own utterances, and for reasons not convincing. Then again, a leader who begins to boast of his past services and sacrifices invites invidious comparison and odious criticism. Judged by the standard of sacrifices, tribulations and sufferings in the cause of the country the Moderate leaders must appear very poor as compared with those who are leading the Extremists. Is there one man in the whole Moderate party whose sacrifices and sufferings amount to anything at all as compared with those of Bal Gangadhar Tilak, or Arabindo Ghosh? With the loss of the Pandit Malaviya the Moderate camp has lost the last man whose sacrifices could be put to the test of critical analysis, excepting, of course, the Servants of India. The others, with their palatial homes, with large bank accounts, with titles before and after their names, with big estates and mills to make their own lives comfortable, and the lives of their children secure and snug, can hardly talk of sacrifices. Why, the very positions they occupy today they owe to their patriotism. It is ridiculous then, to claim an acceptance of their views on these grounds.

A fight for crumbs

A few years ago the leading organs of the Moderate Party used to say that if anything, or any Indian appeared to be good and acceptable to the *Pioneer* that thing and that Indian should be shunned, or at least looked upon with suspicion. They have lived, however, to see their goodselves admired and praised and eulogized, not only by the *Pioneer* but even by the *London Times*, the *Englishman*, and the *Civil and Military Gazette*. We remember the days when some of these moderate leaders used to praise the once Sir George Clarke (now Lord Sydenham) to the skies. One of them once wrote that when Sir George speaks the whole country listens with stretched ears and bent heads. (We are not quoting the exact words.) Think of the change that has come in their attitude toward the then Sir George Clarke, the present Lord Sydenham. The truth is that all of us are liable to make mistakes. The Moderate leaders have been guilty of blunders in the past, their prudence, foresight, statesmanship and sobriety notwithstanding. Their blunders have been of both kinds, of commission as well as of omission. They have let opportunities for action and advance slip by for lack of courage and want of pluck, by too much prudence and too much expediency, by too much regard for personal safety and

personal welfare, by want of foresight and forethought, by ignorance of world of conditions and world currents. All of us are more or less affected by self-interest. Who among us can boast of being absolutely selfless? It is no calumny, therefore, to say that even Moderate leaders are and have been affected by personal considerations. There are few among men and women of all countries who are prepared to suffer for their convictions. Most of us are consciously or unconsciously affected in our opinions and judgments by personal or family or clannish or party interests. In India certainly the number of such persons as are prepared to stand by their convictions even in the face of sufferings and death is very limited. If it were not so the Indians would not be where they are now. It is, in our judgment, extremely foolish, therefore, for any one to claim the acceptance of any views because they are held by Sir So-and-So or Honorable So-and-So. On the other hand, it is equally foolish to base any argument on false analogies or to indulge in catch words. Facts are facts and they must be faced.

We yield to none in our desire to see our country free, absolutely free. But our conception of freedom perhaps differs from that of both the Moderates and

the Extremists. The Moderates want colonial self-government by steps, and so do the Extremists. They differ on steps. Both are prepared to agree to the overwhelming preponderance of power which the holders of property, the possessors of special privileges, would maintain in their respective schemes over those that have nothing but their bodies and souls. Special representation is being claimed for the landlord, the big merchant, the capitalist, the aristocrat, as well as for the Mussalman, for the Sikh, for the native Christian, for the domiciled Europoan. These claims are almost all backed up by the Moderate leaders. There are few among them (all honor to those who are) who can freely vote in a way that will displease the big Zamindar, the Taluqdar, and the millowner. The greatest democratic leader of Bengal is always anxious to keep on the side of the big property holders. He is very happy when they call him the Tribune of the people. His clarion voice gives utterance to beautiful pharases and thoughts framed in inspiring language, but when the time for lofty action comes he is always on the side of property and privilege and power. He has his prototypes in other provinces also. The truth is that the Nationalist leaders are and have been laying too much emphasis on expediency and prudence and

We are neither saints nor devils—only human beings, subject to all the laws of change and growth.

Our patriotism is sometimes as tainted as that of leaders in free countries. Really speaking, there are no free peoples in the world. The democracies of the United States, Great Britain and France are only democracies in name. The men in power, those who possess property, enjoy privileges are as tyrannical towards their own common people as they are towards us. Only they fear the former more than they fear us. They never do things for the sake of justice and fair play. They do things when they are afraid of consequences of not doing them. So long as they are safe, or believe they are safe, they oppress their own people and their own coutrymen almost as much as they do us. They exploit them mercilessly; they make them draw water and hew wood for them. No one need place much faith on their liberal or democratic professions. There are very few who are really liberal, who have the courage of their convictions; who act as they feel. Morleys and Bryces only differ in degree from Curzons and Milners. Do not pin your faith in any of them. At heart the Liberals and Conservatives are the same. The Liberals have killed Liberalism

in Great Britain by their hyrpocitical, time-serving Imperialism and Capitalism.

[The people from whom Young India should draw inspiration are those who live or have lived by the sweat of their brow, who are or have been producers, who know or have known what poverty and ignorance and lack of opportunity and subservience to others mean. Even among them there are some talkers and writers who are professionals, who have big bank accounts and who have amassed wealth by saying good things and playing on the imagination and fancy of the common people. Even they are not the real people who should inspire us in our struggle.] Young India should stand by Keir Hardies, Lansburys and Smillies.

To our extremist countrymen we beg to submit that in our judgment there is great force in the statement that complete independence will not be to our advantage. As for full home rule, so long as the masses do not show almost incontestably that they are with us, it is not likely to be granted, not because of the reasons that our national enemies advance, not for lack of intelligence or character; not because we are divided by cleavages of religion,

race, language and culture; not because we have huge illiteracy, not even because we are too poor, but for different reasons. We are poor because others do not let us use what we have. Our illiteracy is no disgrace. Even in our illiteracy we are more sober, more thoughtful and more cosiderate that the literate millions of America and Europe. We are not lacking in character because we have more of self-control, more of plain honesty, more of simplicity, less of greed, and less of the desire to kill others than the Europeans and Americans have. Neither are the cleavages of religion, race and language any bar to Home Rule in India. They are to be found in other countries which are free. What we lack is firmness to stand by our rights, vigor and determination to resist oppression, tyranny and wrong doing, whether practised by our own countrymen or by foreigners; readiness to suffer for the cause and the country; willingness to stand by what is right and truthful even if we lose the whole world by such a stand. But the chief reason is that we have no power to enforce our demand for Home Rule. The military argument, the argument of the "silver bullets," the argument of industrial strike and Labor Unions are all lacking. So long as they are lacking, however, much we may foam and fret, we shall never get Home Rule.

A fight for crumbs

We are neither Moderate nor Extremist, nor even "revolutionary" in the ordinary sense of the word. In our judgment both the Moderates and the Extremists have so far failed to give the right lead.

The Moderates have taught us ultra-moderate prudence, expediency, over-cautiousness, dread of democracy and an undue respect for authority. Yet the Moderates have produced great souls like Gokhale and Malaviya.

Nor have the Extremists been free from the vices of demagogy, conceit and swelling of the head. They have produced great souls, like Aurobindo and Tilak, to speak only of the Hindus. The Mussalmans have produced some really good men like the Ali brothers, Jinnah, Hasan Imam and Rasul.

The man, however, who is after our own heart, though we do not always agree with him in politics, is Gandhi.

The Revolutionaries have shown great courage and spirit of sacrifice but they have also taught us lying and deception, double-dealing and duplicity, besides murder, assassination, robbery and dacoity. It is hopeless to expect a country to be great by any of these methods.

What the country needs is a band of leaders pledged to absolute truthfulness, frankness, openness and, above all, fearlessness and simplicity. We want leaders who will live like the common people, eating the food of the common people, dressing as the common people, sometimes working with their hands for their living, and sharing with the common people their thoughts, their anxieties, and their troubles. We want leaders who will not make false or equivocal defence whenever the authorities choose to prosecute them. We want leaders who will not be afraid to attack and criticise the men of property, power and privilege among their countrymen as fearlessly and mercilessly as they do the foreign exploiter, who will realize and preach that what they want is real democracy, genuine democracy, and not the mere substitution of the rule of their own men of property and privilege in place of the foreign Imperialist and capitalist. We do not mind if the real thing comes a little late. What we want is genuine gold and not counterfeit coin. We know that perhaps the rule of our own men will in any case be better than that of the foreigner. At present we have two masters. With the elimination of the foreign exploiter we shall have left one, the domestic one. That is true. We do not oppose the

process of elimination. But at the same time we want a clear realization of the issue. We want to start on the right road, with an absolutely clear conscience. We do not want to give our time and energy and life for the benefit of the native exploiter, be he prince or priest. We want to preach the gospel of social democracy.

Now we do not want to be misunderstood. We know that we can not fly the flag of Socialism. We do not understand Socialism. We have never studied it. We do not go by dogmas and doctrines. We know this much—that the present constitution of society is wrong and unjust. It is cruel and barbaric —even more barbaric than it ever was in primitive times, before the dawn of civilization. Civilization has brought misery and hunger, death and disease to the masses of mankind. Wo do not want to go back to the primitive age. We cannot go back, even if we would. We want an era of equal opportunity and equal justice to all. In our judgment it is the first duty of every government to see,

(1) That not a single member of the body politic suffers from lack of clean and nourishing food, from want of sanitary housing and decent clothing.

(2) That every child of a mother, whether it be of lawful or unlawful origin (every child is of lawful origin, in so far as he is the product of natural impulses and absolutely natural forces) shall get not only good food and good clothing but ample opportunities for education and development on its own lines.

(3) That every adult must contribute to the sum total of a nation's living. That every adult must engage himself or herself in some productive or creative work, whether physical or intellectual.

(4) That every member of society gets sufficient leisure to devote himself to the cultivation of the finer side of himself.

(5) That no one kills another unless in self-defense or in defense of society.

(6) That every one has according to the needs of himself and his family free access to land, air, water and other natural and artificial products, necessary to make a decent living and lead a decent life.

(7) That no one uses another against his or her will by force or threat.

(8) That every one has an equal political status except when by common consent and for common purposes he or she is invested with a higher status for a temporary period.

(9) That every one is entitled to select his or her own habitat and membership in a social group, into which he or she likes to gain admittance, provided he or she does not thereby infringe on the liberties or rights of others.

(10) That men and women are treated alike with rights and obligations differentiated only by their physical constitutions.

Subject to these principles, if any member of a social group makes more wealth or comes into possession of it by the sweat of his brow, he is welcome to have it and enjoy it if thereby he inflicts no wrong on others, jointly or severally.

These are our principles and we want a body of sincere men to preach them in India.

In our judgment the era of political revolutions is over. It is shortsighted to try to bring about revolutions by assassinations, murders, terrorism, or dacoity, only to find that we have substituted one

class of masters for another. What we need is none of these methods.

We want a body of Indian politicians to agitate and press the claim that every tiller of the soil gets sufficient land or such tenure as will enable him to earn a decent and comfortable living. The Government has no right to tax a man whose income is not sufficient for the elemental needs of himself and those who are dependent on him. Nor has the landlord any right to squeeze all he can out of starving cultivators, regardless of the fact that what is left is sufficient for him and his family or not. Down with the foolish doctrine of demand and supply. Down with competition. We insist that the Government of India, whether manned by the British or by the Indian so change the land laws as to secure a sufficient holding to every tiller of the soil on terms which will enable him to live a decent life.

The inauguration of new industries is very good. We want industrial development but even there we do not want it under conditions which will deny the wage-earner a decent living wage. We insist upon the recognition of the right of every human being to a decent living whether that living is made out of

land or from industries. We maintain that a body politic which does not recognize that duty is a lawless body existing on the exploitation of human beings. All other needs of a body politic—the need of security from without and from within—the need for public works, for highly paid Government servants, for national pleasures—must be subject to this elemental duty. We want the Indian political leaders to take up that question and to hammer it. It will have its effect on all legislation. It will create a political and economic consciousness among the masses which will in time become irresistible. Besides, it will be an acid test of the sincerity of those Britishers who say that they are in India in the interest of and for the good of the masses and who oppose Home Rule because they believe that unless the masses are politically conscious of their rights their interests can be better looked after by the British officials than by their own educated and propertied countrymen. Of course we know that this is a lie. But then, why not hold them to what they say and ask them to prove their sincerity by deeds. Let us ask them what they are prepared to do, so that the *ryot* may earn a decent living according to modern standards of comfort as administered in the light of Indian conditions. Let us prepare a catechism on

these lines and submit it to every British legislator, pointing out at the same time how the various British Governments in India are even now employed in creating big landlords, bankers, merchants, high pension-holders. Men are being allowed assignments from public revenues who already possess more than they need, simply because they are sycophants and support the various Governors and Lieutenant-Governors in their nefarious policies. These are termed rewards for loyalty. Why are not these rewards disbursed from the English Exchequer? Why is the poor Indian *ryot* being saddled with them?

We are sorry to see well intentioned, apparently honest, intelligent countrymen wasting their breath, time and energy on non-essentials and ignoring essentials. By so doing they distract the public mind and prevent the focussing of public attention on matters which really count.

In all humiliation and earnestness who submit these lines for their consideration and attention, though we can anticipate the reply—"Unpractical, impossible, inexpedient." To lawyers, landlords, big capitalists, and big officials, well-paid editors, and titled gentlemen a scheme like that *must always* appear impractical.

A fight for crumbs

But what about the "servants of India"? Why are they wasting away their lives to bolster up capitalism? Perhaps by force of habit—and for want of anything better to do. Why are they licking the boots of the bureaucracy, why are they cringing before Sirs, Justices and Rajas? Why we repeat and pause for a reply.

Behave Like Men.*

How can I tell you what I feel at the present moment about the situation in the Punjab? My heart is full though my tongue is dumb. I wish I had wings to fly and reach the dear land I love above everything else. I have tried my very best to be with you but I have failed. I do not wish to be a martyr but I long to be of use to you in your troubles. The most that I can do is to advise you in the light of the knowledge that I have and the experience that I have gathered. Listen, weigh, decide and determine.

My heart is bitter, my sole is sore I am filled with anger at the doings of the bureaucracy but even more so at the conduct and behaviour of my own countrymen. It is the latter whom I hold responsible for all the sufferings and the shame that you have been afflicted with. All honour to the leaders who stood by you and have suffered. They are not responsible for the excesses of the mob. The responsibility of the latter's deeds lies on the heads

---

Lala Lajpat Rai open letter to Young Punjab.

of those who have kept aloof, who always keep aloof where there is risk to be run, who provoke other to do deeds of violence but themselves keep behind the *purdah,* who are patriots when the sun shines but cynics when there is an occasion to act. I can write pages and pages in their " honour " but I will not do so. If there ever was a time when there was need for restraint it is the present I will therefore restrain myself and come to the point direct.

The first thing that I ask of you is to stand by the leaders who have suffered for you, regardless of caste, creed and party—Harikishan Lal, Duni Chand, Ram Bhaj Dutt, Satya Pal, Kichlu, Amar Nath, Mohan Lal, Mangal Sen, Labh Singh, Sarb Dyal, Mutiullah, Krishna and others whose names I do not at present know. You know that I have differed from them in the past, differed seriously about their policy, their work and their behaviour. But at the present time the only thing that I wish to remember is that they are the victims of the reactionary policy of the Punjab government; that their crime is patriotism. As such they are all dear to me and I pay to them the homage that is due to suffering and bleeding patriotism. I have forgotten all their personal weaknesses and faults. At the present moment the

only thing that matters is their suffering. Henceforth I shall worship them. I do not wish to make any invidious distinction but there is one person among this group of whom I must speak separately —my dear friend Duni Chand. Where in the land of the five rivers is there a person nobler, truer, purer and bolder than Duni Chand? Having neither wealth nor excessive talents, nor an extended practice at his back the man has fought single-handed for high principles and noble practices, for the rights of the poor against the rich, for pure democracy, against great odds. I have had the privilege of working with him in the Municipal Committee, in the Indian Association, and in the Congress and I can truthfully say that I never came across a more disinterested and high-minded public man than Duni Chand. To his children and to his wife my heart goes forth in full sympathy.

Young Punjabees, I wish you to stand by your suffering leaders, bravely, nobly and in pure spirit. In the past we have not always done that and hence our misfortunes and troubles. Let me assure you that the source of mischief lies in our own chicken-heartedness, in our timidity, in our selfishness and egotism, in our inconstancy and disloyalty to our

friends and not in any thing that our leaders have done or said. The Punjabees are generous people, they are brave, and noble-hearted but somewhat lacking in loyalty of love and comradeship. In the past we have often deserted our comrades and mingled our voice of denunciation, disapproval, and disapprobation with the voices of our enemies. Our enemies are very clever, astute, cunning, diplomatic and powerful. They know how to inoculate innocent and inexperienced minds with the poison of distrust and suspicion; they know how to play on the instincts of self-preservation, self-interest and egotism; they know how to appeal to the desire of gain and safety inherent in every human being; they know how to divide and split. We have in the past played in their hands too much. Shall we not learn from bitter experience and avoid the mistakes of the past? We have amongst us many a person who speaks into your confidence, only to betray you, who beguiles you with offers of help and intercession, who appeals to you in the name of prudence and patriotism. Take note of these persons and keep clear of them. Then we have amongst us many a person truly noble and patriotic, *wedded to institutions.* Remember that institutions are only means to ends. They are for us and not we for them. A people

morally high alive to a sense of responsibility, self-sacrificing and ready to suffer for principle and for causes can raise institutions but a people morally degraded, dead to a sense of honour, devoid of a spirit of comradeship, of constancy and loyalty to friends and co-workers, always ready to compromise and temporize, ready to change their principles in every emergency cannot in the long run save institutions. Institutions cannot instil life, cannot be a source of inspiration, unless led by men of life and spirit. Stick to your institutions, keep them, save them, stand by them, in every way you can, but never let your higher natures be drowned in the sea of anxiety to save them at the cost of everything else. Remember we are in a stage of transition. Actual success in figures whether in the field of social organization, in that of education or even in that of politics, does not matter so much as the spirit by which the nation is permeated and inspired. We were once the wealthiest people on earth, most learned, best educated, but the moment we became dispirited we lost everything. Do not then let yourself be deceived by figures and nnmbers. Do not let your *morale* and your *spirit* suffer for the sake of institutions and numbers and figures. Let your spirit stand high and undefiled and uncorrupted though lonely.

Pardon me for this sermon. In my judgment this was necessary. I am told that the Punjab is dead and demoralized. All public life has ceased to function and everybody is afraid. Lawyers have refused to defend "political offenders" and newspapers have ceased publication. Friendship, love, sympathy, comradeship and fellow feeling have all disappeared. Every one is for himself and the devil for the rest. I can picture the conditions. I saw something of that kind in 1907 and then in 1910. But this time the blow has been the hardest and consequently the knock-out most complete. Our enemies are rejoicing and jubilant, our "friends" silent, and cynically apportioning blame on this or that. Some find fault with Gandhi, others with others.

Young Punjabees, I appeal to you with all the earnestness which I can command, to throw off this demoralization, this spirit of fault-finding, this lowness of *morale*, this cynicism and this worship of self. Stand by your transported and imprisoned leaders, enshrine the names and qualities of those that have died or have to die; give them all the sympathy and help you can; honour and revere them. Your sympathy and appreciation strengthen their soul and

help them in bearing their misfortunes but above all be up and doing. Re-build your public life, start your newspapers, revive your political associations, and educate and organize your people. I do not want you to do that in a spirit of revenge or hatred. Do not let your system be poisoned by hate. Avoid and eschew all kinds of violence—of intention, speech or deed. *We are neither fit nor ripe for a militant revolutionary struggle.* We want a revolution, but not of force or violence. *We want a change of heart and a transformation of brains.* What we need is not violence but *firmness*, not vacillation but *determination*, not expediency and time-serving but *principles and a resolution to stand by them,* come what may. Do not worry about your rich men. Let them do as they please. *Organize the middle class, the peasants and the workers.* Do not talk to them of hatred and revenge, nor of force and violence, but of co-operation and consolidation, of their rights and their duties, of the necessity of organization and education, of the duty of taking a broader view of things and developing a comprehensive outlook, of the necessity of sacrificing the individual for the community and the community for the nation. Let your newspapers avoid violent language, at the same time keeping clear of sycophancy, flattery and praises of the

authorities that be. We want solid truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Let your Hindu Sabhas and Moslem Leagues take care of themselves. *They are to a great extent responsible for all your troubles.* Avoid all such organizations. Their basis is false, their propaganda untrue, their example poisonous and their company demoralizing. Give up all religious, credal and communal controversies, at least for a time. Cultivate the spirit of fellowship on national, political and economic basis. Organize, educate and agitate. Form yourselves into self-denying groups. Fill your minds with sound knowledge and start newspapers and magazines, not for profit but for education.

In my judgment Mr. Gandhi is the best leader you have just now. Imbibe his spirit and follow his lead. Suffer patiently, firmly and manfully, when you have to suffer. Do not cry like children "that man did it, he told me, he misled me, he is at fault and not I." Behave like men. Remember the Sikh Gurus who have left the most ennobling example you have in your history of suffering for principle. I am sorry I cannot help you directly but I will do all that I can with tongue, pen and money, even though I may not be with you in body. I will beg, borrow

and steal for you. I will work for you and send you what I earn. Let it not be said of the Punjabees of the early twentieth century that they were so poor in spirit that one blow crushed them completely and demoralized them irretrievably.

The way to Salvation.

The indian publicists must recognise once for all that the country will not make any appreciable progress towards freedom if they must always counsel prudence and sitting on the fence. There is some risk in every enterprise. There are great risks in the enterprise of preparing a nation for the struggle for freedom. While no safeguard ought to be neglected for avoiding manifestations of lawlessness and recourse to violence, the movement for freedom must be accelerated by *personal risks and individual or group sufferings*. I am thus wholeheartedly in favour of your policy of passive resistance, and after giving my most careful consideration to what your critics have said, I have failed to find therein anything cogent to convince me to the contrary. I deplore the excesses at Amritsar, Kasur, Gujranwala and other places but judging from a distance, I am proud of the success you achieved in this first attempt at passive resistance in India. It is an achievement unique in our history, nay even in the history of the world. It has raised the political consciousness of

* Lala Lajpat Rai's letters to Mr. Gandhi.

the country by one big leap and also raised the country in the estimation of the world.

Passive resistance ought to be resorted to with great care and caution. It should not be allowed to descend to the level of the ridiculous. But when after wise calculation it is decided to have recourse to it, everyone should be prepared for casualties. My heart bleeds for the sufferings of my countrymen of the Punjab and I am extremely sorry that certain things should have happened as they did at Amritsar, Gujranwala and Kasur, but otherwise I am proud of the success of the all-India *Hartal.* In matters like these success is not to be reckoned in rupees and annas or even in the actual attitude of the Government but in the spirit which is evoked by the undertaking. Mahatmaji, I for one, am proud of you, and of my country, even more than I ever was before.

The Congress has been trying to educate those who were already educated. The Congress leaders have looked to their rulers for the redress of their grievances, you look to the soul force of the country. It is the latter along with economic force, that will win in the end. If the salvation of the country has to depend on our English educated countrymen then it will never be achieved. Even the Government

will not make any concessions unless they know that your demands are backed by the people. The people must be educated politically and they cannot be educated by the methods so far followed by the Congress leaders. Pardon me, Sir, (I have already earned a name for being tactless and indiscreet) for saying bluntly, that the old Congress leaders have always felt shy of the masses.

I have no faith in the sincerity of the Indo-British Association, nor do I believe in the propaganda started by the Dr. Nair school of Non-Brahmin politicians of the South, but are all their statements about the educated leaders having been rather cold towards the masses entirely devoid of truth? While we have felt that our own incomes, counted in hundreds and thousands and lacs, were small, we never felt *sufficiently* that the poor in India required at least tens. But for the efforts of a Digby and a Naoroji the statements of the Anglo-Indians about the prosperity of the masses might have remained unrefuted. How many of our leading publicists have even tried to understand the troubles of the masses by actual contact with them? They have made speeches, written loads of articles full of generalities and common platitudes, but how many of

them can honestly say that they know of the condition of the masses by personal contact? The Servant of India, the Seva Samitis, the Volunteers in Bengal and in the Punjab have been doing a little, the leaders have given a few rupees in charity, now and then, but as to a real substantial effort to understand and realise their misery there has not been much of that. As to any of us serving to help them, why that has never entered our heads. We have been objecting to our rulers spending so much money on their annual trips to the hills. What have we been doing ourselves? The fact is that we have set up an extravagant standard of importance to what we are pleased to call 'brain work' as against manual work. A successful lawyer making from Rs. 1000 to Rs. 5000 a month is entitled to spend three months on the hills to take rest while a farmer or a trader or a clerk not making more than 100 or 200 or 300 or even 500 rupees a year must rot in the plains. Is really the work of a lawyer of more use to the nation than that of a farmer or a teacher or a miner? I am not saying this in a spirit of carping criticism. I have been one of them doing no better and no worse. But I am saying this because in any judgment the *spirit* of our political movement requires a *complete* change. The country will never be free, it will not deserve to be

free, as long as it does not produce leaders, who will look to the people, rather than to the authorities, for inspiration, for guidance for light. Let me say in all sincerity that the people in India as elsewhere are much more honest, sincere and self-sacrificing than their so-called educated leaders. They are unlettered, unversed in the use of diplomatic lies, but even when they lie you can easily find out what is in their mind than you can in the case of the so-called educated leaders. Who among us does not lie? Some utter diplomatic lies, others unsophisticated, undiluted, bare lies. An ordinary labourer is much more honest and truthful than the greatest among the English statesmen. He robs no one, he deceives none, he imposes on none. He works hard, and lives a life of truth. What is true of Great Britain is true of India. Let us give up comouflaging and fix our mind on the truth. What our masses need most are not sermons on the subtleties of Vedanta or Vairagya, nor lectures on Self-government, but right comradely accociation, brotherly sympathy, and easy, unsophisticated, unfettered communication, with their better educated and better situated countrymen. Give them that and you will sooner uplift the country, than by centuries of lectures and sermons and by yards of resolutions.

Having seen some of the best parts of the world, I have come to the conclusion that the Indian masses are comparatively more intelligent, more sober, more amenable to reason than any other people similarly situated. We have to make them conscious of their great potentialities by working *with them* in a spirit of co-operation and not working *for them* in a spirit of patronage.

The greatest need of the country, as it appears to me, is the economic uplift of the masses accompanied by universal education of the right sort. If I had any influence over the Indian Press I would beg of them to carry the following captions in big capital letters over the first page of every newspaper, in every issue:

The greatest need of the Country
Milk for babies
Food for adults
Education for all.

The government must supply these or let us rule ourselves. The nation must be made to realise that no one is entitled to any milk unless the babies first, the mothers, the sick and the invalid next have got it; that no one is entitled to luxuries, not even the officials, unless every man and woman in the nation

has been well-fed. This is just by way of illustration.

An organisation should be started in every district to make a full and economic survey of the country as may be possible. These organisations should prepare charts of minimum average standards of food and clothing required for a wealthy and efficient life with figures and facts. We will then be in a position to give the lie to the oft-repeated statements of prosperity made by officials. Why do not these Non-Brahman organisations in the Deccan do this work? I think it is time that our political agitators instead of trading in phrases should uncover facts.

Please do not misunderstand me. I do not mean to say that mere figures will remove poverty. By no means. Figures will expose the poverty and the misery of the country as no general phrases can.

The thing to be immediately done is to organise the country for economic purposes starting with the peasants and the labourers. We must start from the bottom. The top people will take care of themselves. I want more of economic action, not necessarily at the cost of political talk, but in addition to it and as

a necessary fulcrum for it. The nation must be fed on truth and not on catchphases.

*   *   *   *

(1) No nation which has *Imperial* ambition and the power to satisfy it, can be said to have *any sense of justice* or can be admired as a *champion of* freedom and democracy. The two things are inconsistent. You may, if you like, admire the people thereof for power, strength, statesmanship, or enlightened selfishness, but when you admire them for their '*sense of justice*' or for their '*love of freedom*' you say what is not true, never mind whether you do it *consciously*, for the sake of expediency, or *unconsciously* out of habit. In my judgment the Indian leaders, who constantly harp on the British sense of justice, and of the British love of freedom for all peoples, mislead their people and thereby cause a great deal of harm to the cause of political progress in their country. Instead of making the people realize the situation as it is, and letting them adapt themselves to it for the purposes of progress on right lines they cover the situation with a lot of camouflage and thereby do positive harm to the cause of their country. British Imperialism is as *selfish and autocratic* as any Imperialism in the history of the

world ever was or could be. We may appeal to the British in the name of justice, if we must, but we should not labour under any misapprehension that British 'justice' is any way better than any other Imperial 'justice.' In the history of the British Empire 'justice' was never done to the claims of any dependency or colony, except under extreme pressure and for selfish reasons. Even in the case of South Africa it was more enlightened self-interest than pure unadulterated love of justice that led Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman to grant them Dominion status.

(2) I believe that *comparatively speaking* there is a large percentage of true and honest Internationalists in Great Britain than in any other country in the world except perhaps in Russia and the United States. These English Internationalists do sincerely believe in *justice and liberty for all people.* But they are in a hopeless minority, and consequently their influence on British statesmanship is extremely limited.

(3) The only classes in Great Britain to whom it is any use *appealing* for *International justice* are the socialists or the laborites. The liberal party contains some very fine souls but the bulk of them are rank Imperialists and their Imperialism is, in my judg-

ment, more harmful to the world of dependencies than that of the Tories. The Tories have little recourse to camouflage. They are brutally frank, blunt, and outspoken in their aims and politics. A water and milk kind of Liberalism is a *positive danger* to a nation striving for freedom. What the latter needs is the truth so that she may know what to do. In their economic policy the Tories are more honest than the Liberals. Both are devoted Imperialists; but the Tories make no pretence of their love of democracy in the abstract. The Liberals talk a great deal of *justice* and *democracy* and *liberty*, but when the time for action comes, they act even worse than the Tories.

(4) I think that the Indian leaders should tell their people the *truth and nothing but the truth.* The law will not perhaps allow of the *whole truth* being told. The people ought to know that it is foolish for them to appeal to the Liberals; that the Liberals will do nothing for them, and to take shelter under the hackneyed utterances of our old leaders about the 'British sense of justice' and the 'British love for freedom' etc., is just deceiving themselves.

There is little justice even in Great Britain. Whenever there is a clash of interests, the ruling

classes treat their poor compatriots as ruthlessly as they do in India. In England the poor classes have, by the power of vote and by organised action, economic and political, succeeded in bettering their condition. Their appeals to the sense of justice of the ruling classes are as fruitless as ours are and will be. Whatever they have gained they have won by the mere force of organised action. If the Indians want to get their rights they have just to be conscious of their rights and organise. They will never get anything by appealing to the British sense of justice. They must use all the weapons that the governed classes in America and in Great Britain have used and are using for achieving the purpose. In these countries the bulk of the population is opposed to the use of violence or force, not on ethical grounds so much as on practical. It is considered useless and demoralising to threaten violence, or to try to use force against organised governmental forces. If it is so in countries where every one is free to keep and learn the use of fire arms, it is even more so in India. Ethics aside, the policy of using violence or force to oust the British from India is foolish. Indian youths desirous of serving their country and of advancing the cause of freedom must learn to control their temper. I think

that at times it is very difficult to do so, and look cowardly to take things lying down, but then the outlet should be found in other ways. I am not in favour of taking insults, individual or national, in a spirit of weak submission, but I am strongly convinced of the futility of force for national purposes. I have nothing to add to what I have already said in my previous letter about terrorism and secret Societies.

* * * *

Some days ago in response to your desire I sent you a rather lengthy letter, in which I developed some of my views, which had been briefly hinted at in the first letter I had written to you. Since the second letter was posted, I have been reflecting whether I had not been rather unduly critical of my educated countrymen in general, and the 'old leaders' in particular. Considering the education they received and the environments in which they were brought up could they have acted differently? Does not then the responsibility of their conduct lie on the system of education in vogue in India. I have expressed my views on education in a series of articles, some of which have been published in the *Modern Review*, and the others will be found in a

book* which will be shortly published. I do not propose to repeat what I have said in those articles and in that book. But I am going to take advantage of this opportunity in giving expression to some thoughts, which have not been dealt with in that series.

We have so far, I am afraid, paid too much attention to the machinery of education and only little, very little to aims and ideals or even the right methods. In considering the latter, we may as well divide them into modern and ancient. Under the term modern, we include the ideas that have had the world in their grip since the advent of the Industrial Revolution. Under ancient we consider all the systems of education that prevailed in the world before that.

The ancients paid much, too much attention to 'life after death' to the study of the 'scriptures', to the mastery of languages and to rituals and formulas. They professed to care more for soul than body, they tortured the latter and tried to live lives that to the moderns seem to be unnatural. In learning languages they devoted precious years to grammar, syntax and prosody and pronunciation

* "The Problem of National education in India" which has since been published.

and what was left was mainly given to rituals and formulas. Under that system religion was more or less identified with the latter. It depended more on form than spirit, more on dogma than character, more on beliefs than deeds. In trying to revive the ancient system we have so far failed to get rid of the superficialities. Even in reformed, religious seminaries, religion still continues to be buried in form and formulas, dogmas and creeds, books and shastras. Even when our teachers and professors and lecturers expound the Upanishads they care more for the letter of the text than for the spirit. Everyone uses them for the support of his own creed. What we need is not a creed but Dharma. Creed does not help us, at least not much, to find our souls. Our souls we can find only by looking inward and adjusting our outward circumstances to it. No one can lead a life of Dharma unless his outward and inward beings are in harmony, unless he thinks rightly, feels rightly and acts rightly. No education which fails to help us to that end is worthy of being called religious. Religion does not consist of contemplation only, but contemplation and action. Religion cannot be taught. It is a thing which *grows*. It can not grow in a soil which has not been cleared of the falsities of thought and life. People who have to

sing songs of loyalty to order, or to pass resolutions in which they do not believe, or to admire men whom they detest, or to conceal thoughts which should be expressed, make a caricature of religion when they start teaching it. No one should attempt to *teach religion* unless he is prepared to suffer for the whole truth. I believe that Dharma murdered or mutilated or strangled becomes very dangerous to those professing to follow it in a mutilated form. To attempt to divorce Dharma from life is a very very risky affair. Then for *Dharma* to justify the existing social structure on the basis of *Karma* and upholding the prevailing ideas as to property, inheritance, marriage, law and government is perpetuating the *untruth*. The 'modern' system of education has a different kind of curse on its head. It is buried in text-books, examinations and diplomas. It extols and holds for admiration all the prevailing ideas of property and marriage, government and law.

We have been educated and brought up under a system of life which gives property and wealth the position of God. We talk of an incorporeal, immaterial, just, merciful and all wise God, but all the time the education we receive and the impetus we get from our surroundings exhort us to believe that

the real God to be worshipped, to be adored and to be sought, is gold and property. Even those who talk to us of spiritual things and want us to despise wealth show by their *example* that they adore and worship wealth. Some of our noblest teachers and leaders have set an admirable example by deliberate vows of poverty and by giving up the pursuit of wealth in favour of duty and Dharma. My respect for them is profound and genuine. But it pains me to see that in the practical elucidation and application of their plans they attach as much importance to wealth, property and capital as any one else does. The fact is that they cannot help it. For the successful operation of their schemes and programmes they need money. This they cannot get unless they go to those who have it. These latter, then, have to be flattered and propitiated. The moment a religious man does this he degrades himself. Unconsciously he gives utterance to lies or half-truths, straight or diplomatic, and lends the sanction of his approval to schemes and proceedings which are anything but honourable. He gains his immediate object, viz., he gets money for his school, college, orphan asylum, club, society, library or anything of that kind but he injects an insidious poison into the social body of his people. He praises and advertises men whose method

of acquiring wealth he does not approve of, he gives them places of honour, he concedes to them a right of controlling the institutions for which he gets their money and so on. He does it with the best of intentions but what he does has the practical effect of enthroning ill-gotten wealth on the highest pedestal. He may say that it is no part of his business to trace back the source of money that comes to his hands for good and useful purposes; and that he need not go beyond its immediate use, and that it is not his business to sit in judgment on those who give him wealth for admittedly fine and worthy objects. In my judgment this is pure sophistry. Our education leads us to look with approval, appreciation and respect on those who are *clever* though not honest and good, who trample upon the rights of others to amass wealth and obtain position, who use their trained intellect to get the better of those whose intellects are not trained, who make a perverted use of logic, philosophy, law and language in order to make money and achieve positions of command and wealth. If you will examine the textbooks taught in our schools, if you will look into the souls of our teachers, if you will ascend a little higher and peer into the minds of the officers of the Educational Department, if you will look around you and examine the general atmosphere of respect-

ability pervading society, you will find everywhere and on all sides the supremacy of wealth, property and sophistry. You go through a court of justice and watch the questions and cross-questions put to witnesses and you will find that the respectability of a witness is made to depend upon his wealth and property. Even when we know that a certain wealthy person has made his pile by bribery, flattery, misappropriation etc, we respect him and hold him up for respect because of the *fact* of his being wealthy. Now in this matter we are on the horns of a dilemma. We are being ruled by a nation whose God is wealth. In order to save ourselves we have (1) to dam the outgoing flood, (2) to use the same methods of making money as have made them rich and (3) to adopt their philosophy of life. In order to win the respect of our rulers we have to adopt certain brands of respectability which they have introduced. Some have commended themselves to our judgment; others we follow and practise just to please them. We cannot help doing so. In the long run there is one idea which haunts us day and night, there is only one test of right and wrong and that is the approval of our rulers. Even when we are not making a bid for their approval, we are dominated by the fear of incurring their displeasure. The

springs of our conduct can be traced to (1) the desire of winning the approval and the favour of our rulers, (2) the desire of getting on well and of making-money to be rich and respectable (which are practically one and the same thing), (3) the desire of avoiding their displeasure. Anything that is left of our own nature and Dharma comes afterwards. At this stage I wish to guard against being misunderstood. I am not advocating *Tyag* (renunciation) or *Vairag* (asceticism). I believe in producing and using wealth, but I believe in *producing* for ***using*** (for individual and national purposes) and not for hoarding or profiteering or exploiting or domineering others. This is a subject into a discussion of which I cannot enter at this place.

So far I can see clearly but no further. How to get rid of the existing demoralisation, build up life and society on a true basis of Dharma with substantial justice, social, political and economic to all, I do not yet know. Of one thing, however, I am certain, viz. that you cannot build up a society like that with competition as foundation. What we can do is to preach the gospel of co-operation, to try to put it in practice as far as possible, to start giving right ideas and organising for purposes of co-operation, the

poorer classes of our countrymen—the peasants and the workers. All classes of people must feel that salvation will come *from within with cooperation, mutual help and mutual trust* and not from *without,* by *endless, heartless, merciless and soulless competition,* nor by begging for favours and concessions. This will take us perhaps a very very long time to achieve anything tangible, but nations cannot be built in months. The world currents are directed in that way and they will help us in our cause onward and forward, if we only make up our mind to go ahead not blindly, passively and thoughtlessly, but intelligently, actively and thoughtfully. The problem before us is how to start the work under the existing political and economic organisation of society. What we want to do is to start to do work on these lines without in any way injuring or affecting the existing national activities and without putting ourselves in conflict with them.

I have my own ideas on this subject which I will develop in another communication some other time.

India—An International Problem.

To an Indian the problem of India is national; to humanity at large it is international. India is such a large slice of earth, and contains such a large population, that no person, interested in the progress of humanity at large and in true internationalism, can ignore its importance. Add to it the fact that it is the pivot of the Orient. As the home of Hinduism, the birth place of Buddhism, and of the most living centre of Islamic activities, it occupies a unique place in Asia. It is the heart of Asia—the key to the Indian Ocean, and the clearing house of most Asiatic trade. It is also the centre of Asiatic culture. China and Japan bow to it in reverence, and Central Asia and Western Islamic countries look to it for support and sympathy. While its human potentialities are great, very great indeed, its natural resources defy imagination. Its "wealth" has been its curse. Militarism and Imperialism have always looked at it with eyes of greed. Half of the world wars have been fought directly or indirectly for it. It has in the past inspired Alexanders, Tamerlanes, Wellesleys, Tsars, and Kaisers with visions of world

empires. It will continue to be the cause of future wars if its problem is not solved in such a way as to place it beyond the reach of military, adventurous, imperialistic intriguers, and industrial exploiters. It has a manly, brave, industrious, intelligent, keenly sensitive, and on the whole cultured and peaceably-inclined population. At no time in their history have the people of India been exploiters of foreign nations. If left to themselves, they can produce enough for themselves, with plenty of time for the cultivation of art and literature. They can help humanity not only with material goods, but even with intellectual and spiritual truths. Self-dependent, free from external intrigues, relying upon their manhood for their defence, and upon their womanhood for development of the finer part of human nature, they can be a bulwark to civilisation, and a bond of union between the East and the West. In blood and race they can claim kinship with both Europeans and Asiatics; in culture, with Greece and Rome and Baghdad; in religion, with the whole world. By genius and tradition they deal in universal terms and values. They have never set up any barriers of religion, colour, or creed to their hospitality, sympathy, and good-will. Even the most caste ridden Hindu is a universalist, admitting that the

soul in the meanest of mankind is the same as his, and the aim of life is to get rid of all artificial barriers and become one with the universe.

It is a tragedy of modern life with its high claims to civilisation, culture, and humanity that such a people should be bullied by a purely materialistic imperialism, kept down (and occasionally shot and killed by the most barbarous of militarisms, and exploited by refined industrialism of the most grasping kind. It is absolutely hypocritical to talk of a League of Nations, and of the reign of true internationalism so long as these things continue to keep down one-fifth of the human race in India alone. Of course, if you include the rest of Asia and Africa, the figures will reach to almost three-fourths. With the three-fourths of humanity under the heel of militaristic imperialism, starved to death both physically and intellectually by a handful of the rest, always cursing and hating their masters, always discontented and disconsolate, how can there be peace on earth? For a handful of men, however brilliant, masterful, clever, and rich, to arrogate the power and the right to rule, dominate and bully the rest of mankind is an intolerable wrong which cannot be tolerated much longer.

There are Britons who often ask me and my compatriots: "What do we want?" The very disingenuousness of the question is staggering and shows the utter callousness to which intelligent human beings can be reduced by the strong drink of military power. What should a nation, politically ruled by an alien race, industrially dominated by foreign capitalists, financially exploited by greedy financiers of other lands, intellectually starved by imperial educationalists, sermoned day and night by men of no spiritual vision, want? For one of the latter category to ask us what we want, and why we are discontended, cannot be explained by lack of immagination, but only by absolute lack of human comprehension. Why? Do they think we are mere bricks or stones? Why should we not be happy under British rule they ask us? It is a pity that the obvious answer does not strike them—because it is British and not ours. For forty years we have been trying hard to impress upon them the desirability of giving us ground to think of the British connection with India is that between sister nations, but every time they have answered us by gaols and scaffolds, deportations and transportations. Yet they pretend not to know what we want.

What we want is our manhood—the right to live our lives, the opportunity to manage our affairs, in short, to be ourselves. As Indians we can be a source of strength to Britain as well as to the rest of humanity, contributing to the world's stock of knowledge, art and science, poetry and music, co-operating freely, voluntarily, and whole-heartedly in keeping the peace of the world and in carrying aloft the banner of human progress. As British slaves we are mere pawns in the game, to be used to crush the liberties of other nations, or as "drawers of water and hewers of wood" for the Empire. When British statesmen use Indian soldiers in Mesopotamia Egypt, and other parts of the world, they do so from calculation. They reckon that it will make us hated by the people of these countries, but they forget that the shield has another side. We do not incur hatred from the fact, but sympathy among these people who desire to see us free, so that the British may not be in a position to use us against them. In my judgment the first legislation which the proposed League of Nations should undertake is to prohibit the use of mercenary soldiers anywhere outside the land of their nativity. To let the imperial nations of the world use their subject peoples as mercenary soldiers to fight out imperial wars is a crime of the

worst kind. So long as this can be done no small or backward or weak nations can be safe even if they are members of the so-called League of Nations.

The Bolsheviks have been held responsible for using Chinese mercenaries by Britishers who themselves are all the time using Gurkhas (who are not even British Indians) all the world over. Such is imperialistic logic. But why talk of logic? Imperialism knows no logic. It does not deal in humanities. It is singleminded, or using President Wilson's phrase, "it is a one-tracked mind". That mind thinks only in terms of empire, of territories, of subject peoples of markets, and of wealth and glory. Everything else is only secondary.

The Indian nationalist hates nobody, not even the British imperialist. He knows that the latter is the victim of his own egoism—building, castles and palaces, eventually to be burried underneath their ruins. What some of them are afraid of is not the present but the future. Hatred breeds hatred, distrust, imperialism, nationalism. What men of my kind dread is not so much the future of our country as the fate of the world, in case the present hatred between the nations becomes the

ruling passion of the East. We dread to think of the future of the world in case India and China imbibe the spirit of the West and join hands with Islam in Central and Western Asia. Let the gods beware of sowing the wind, lest they may have to reap the whirlwind.

The time for petty concessions is gone. Whether the Sultan remains in Constantinople or is driven back to Anatolia is not of so great an importance as the Indian problem. Of course, we Indians want the Sultan to remain in Constantinople. But what really matters is a satisfactory solution of the problem of India from the Indian point of view.

The Montagu reforms are, at best, a belated, tardy, and inadequate recognition of the importance of the Indian problem.—"*Foreign Affairs.*"

The Dawn of a New Era.*

I cannot adequately thank you for the very affectionate and kind reception you have accorded me all this day. I cannot accept it as due to any of my merits, but as a manifestation of that great spirit which animates this country from one end to the other. I accept that manifestation as a great finger-print from the heavens that we are destined to become great and that this country of ours will once more rise in the scale of Nations. As such I give the credit not to this man or that man but to the spirit in you my friends. Why? India was like a sleeping lion. Once it wakes, it wakes with a momentum that carries with it the force of its ancient greatness. We have never been, in spite of many revolutions that we have undergone, we have never been a selfish people, we have never been an oppressive people. We have behind us the righteousness of scores of generations and hence though we may be fallen, though we may be down-trodden, though we may be weak, though we may be treated with humiliation, we have the potentialities to rise and be great once more. It is that potentiality that you are expressing,

* Speech at Bombay on 20th February 1920.

it is that potentiality which is finding its expression, in this manifestation which I am seeing to-day.

Message to Young India.

This is not the time for me nor the occasion to give you my opinion of the present political situation in this country. I shall beg leave of you to give me time before I express myself on the subject. But there are some fundamental truths which I have learnt to my pleasure in my travels abroad, which I am going to place before you as my message to "Young India." My friend, I must tell you that henceforth we should recognise it as a fundamental doctrine that the unity of the Hindus and Mahomedans will be a great asset to our political future. In this unity we shall not be guided by the temporary benefit of this community or that. We shall not adopt it as a measure of political expediency. But we shall adopt it as a fundamental doctrine of our faith, to stick to our death-beds until we win our freedom. Not till then only, but thereafter too, we shall live in this country as brothers determined to work together, determined to resist together, and determined to win. That is one of the fundamental doctrines which we must adopt as a first article of our political faith.

Now to come to the second article. I must tell

Rely on yourself.

you, do not place any faith upon anybody but yourself, (A voice —'Rightly said.') You can rise only by your own efforts. Remember "Nations are by themselves made." We shall welcome co-operation. We shall welcome advice. We shall welcome guidance also in certain matters. But we shall recent patronage and dictation. We are not babies. We have behind us the grown wisdom of six thousand years back at least, not to say more.

Then I may tell you I have travelled now practi-

India and the world.

cally all over the world and I have seen three of the great self-ruling nations of the world at least the Japanese, the Americans and the Englishmen. And take it from me, that except perhaps in the requirements of modern knowledge, we are inferior to none on the face of the earth. I shall, if I have time, take you department by department and show to you that in no department of associated life, private life are we inferior to any nation of the world. What are we inferior in? We have been inferior in the capacity to unite, we have been inferior to a certain extent in adaptation to the modern requirements, we

have been inferior in learning the lesson of modern diplomacy. There in lies our inferiority. If we had learnt the art of ·telling lies on a broad scale, if we had swept away all our past and had entered into the great arena of violence, if we had done all these things, which at the present moment represent Power in the world, we might have been considered by the great nations of the world as worthy of self-government. But we have been lacking in these qualities.

Be righteous.

And there is one of these qualities which I want you to learn. We have been a righteous nation in all our history and we shall continue to be righteous and to win on the basis of righteousness. I want you to be true to your civilization. Seek truth, speak truth and act truth and I promise you shall win. The modern world is being managed, modern politics are being based upon the rights of the superior and the inferior. We recognise no superior and no inferior. We don't want for our country anything that we are not prepared to concede to other people of the Globe. What we want is the position of equality and nothing else.

Imperialism.

There are some friends of ours who are often tempted by the term Imperialism. They want to be partners in the

great Imperial system. I don't want it. Ladies and Gentlemen, there, is no word coined by the genius of man, more vicious, more sinful, more criminal than Imperialism. And I may tell you that I for one don't want to be a partner in any Imperial system. All that I want for my country is a position of equality, first in the British Commonwealth and then in the nations of the world.

British Commonwealth.

With our connection with Great Britain, we want to co-operate with those British statesmen and politicians, thinkers and workers who want to convert the British Empire into a British Commonwealth. And I may tell you that the world movements foreshadow coming events and unless the British Empire is soon converted into a British Commonwealth it will go to the dogs as other Empires have gone. The safety of the British Empire lies in converting it into a British Commonwealth and we as Indians, as constitutional workers, as Indians believing in the destiny of the whole world, we are prepared to co-operate constitutionally with the whole of our thinking force, with the whole of our character at the back of it to convert that Empire into a Commonwealth of equal and free nations. There are some people who tell us that

the opinion of other people does not count for much. They tell us that the opinion of the British people who are the present rulers of this country naturally matters for our progress. I do not accept that dictim.

League of Nations.

The League of Nations which is at present a humbug, has been established as a fact. It is a fact, and we are a Member of that League of Nations. We want to be a Member of the League with a vengeance. We want to be a living Member of the League of Nations, and not a sleeping partner. Ladies and gentlemen, if we become a living Member of the League of Nations, we have to work up the world opinion in our favour, and to show the world that the calumnies that are being circulated against us of our unfitness, of our divisions, of our weakness of character, and all these things, that those calumnies are baseless and untrue. And how can we repudiate those calumnies unless by work in foreign countries in co-operation those joyous world-spirits which in every country are trying to raise the world into a humanity from the hell that it is at the present moment. We must co-operate, we must mix our voice with them, we must put our soul force with them side by side to enblae them to push the world, from the world of unrighte-

ousness into the world of righteousness and equality for every human being, be he of any continent, or any colour, or of any castes, or of any creed. My friends, I beg of you, my young friends, I entreat you with all the earnestness that I can command and with all the love that I bear you, that this is a most critical time in the history of our nation, not only in the history of our nation, but in the history of humanity.

The Turning-point.

This is a turningpoint.—humanity is taking a turningpoint. Shall we, or shall we not, take our legitimate part as one-fifth of the human race, as the descendants of the mighty ancient Aryans, as the followers of Mahomedan leaders, shall we or shall we not take our part in the making of the new world ? And if we had to take our part in the making of the new world, we must make every effort to make a united stand, to make a truthful stand, to make a righteous stand, to make an unrelenting stand come what may. The Western world powers have lately in the last war shown you an example. What for did they fight ? They said they fought for the democracy. They said they fought for the empire of the world. They said they fought for equal justice. Yet we

know what they fought for. And if they won with all that they could die in millions, lose all their property, sacrifice their children, give up their women, why shall we not, when we stand for the cause of righteousness and truth only? There are people who speak from the mouth true words of great moment and when the occasion for action comes, they eat them up. Even the greatest men of the world have done that. We know what happened at Versailles, and Paris. We know how the world is now treated with peace of statesmanship.

Try to be honest men.

My friends, do not aspire to be statesmen. Try to be honest men, try to be good men, and last but not least, try to be true to yourselves and to the country which gave you birth. (Cheers). We do not want politicians. We will leave them to America. We will leave them to England. Let them settle their differences. We will even leave them to France, my friends, we will also leave them to Japan. We do not want politicians. We want honest, plain-speaking, truth-speaking men and women. That is all. And if we secure that, our salvation is very near. The difficulty is how to convince you of becoming plain-speaking truthful men. Now, I may

tell you one thing. The world has been fighting for material goods. The world has been fighting for the control of capital. The world has been fighting for the control of land. The world has been fighting for the control of markets. The world has been fighting for the control of labour. Capital, wealth, labour, markets, where are they leading the world to? Do you hear the cry from Europe?—that nation is dying, that nation is starving, that nation has become bankrupt, that nation is selling its women, that nation is doing this, and that nation is doing that. We have been starving for a hundred years. Thank God we have not done any of these things. Don't be carried away by false ideals.

Are England and America free?

All the capital of the world cannot save you, cannot bring you freedom. Let me tell you from my experience. We think that these countries are very free. You from here think that England and America and Japan and France are the freest countries on the face of the globe. Well in certain respects, they are. But in certain other respects, let me tell you, take it from me that they are the most servile people on the face of the globe. Why? Few amongst them can speak the truth. Few amongst them have the spirit

of abnegation for higher causes. Where in the world shall we find another man equal in spirit, self-sacrifice and righteousness, equal to Mahatma Gandhi? We may or may not agree with his views. We may or may not follow him. But I challenge the whole world to produce another man like Mahatma Gandhi. Who has produced him? Twentieth centuary India. He is not alone. I can name several other names whose equals you will not find in any other land. Gentlemen, I have tried my very best to take the most generous view, to take the most liberal view of the other nation; but let me tell you honestly, absolutely honestly, that in the power of self-abnegation, in the power of sacrifice for higher causes and higher end there is no other country on the face of the globe which can beat us, only if we direct that spirit of self-sacrifice and self-abnegation to rightful purposes and rightful ends. That is the only thing that is wanted. We have been told here that our politics are corrupt; our politicians are divided; Hindus and Mahomedans are constantly fighting with each other; each caste is prepared to cut the throat of another caste. We have been flouted with the picture of the depressed classes before us.

But let me tell you that this is all Imperial talk. Why? The two great Imperial assets are: first to change the psychology of the people whom they want to govern, and secondly, to change their own psychology. They want it to be believed that they are the choice of the world, and then want to believe that you are the refuse of the world. Therein lies the whole Imperial psychology. You have unfortunately for the last 150 years been believing that you are really inferior to other people.

"Imperial" talk.

Rise up, Young India, you are inferior to none. (Hear, hear). In our common men in the men who till our fields and produce our food, in those men who do not get sufficient to eat twice a day, you have a wealth which no other country on the face of the globe possesses. There are souls ready to redeem themselves and to be redeemed by those men who are ready to redeem them. Even though they will die, even though they will starve they will never dare to steal one mouthful food from the house of the rich. Where on earth is that character to be found? If this state of things were to continue in any other country, I only admire the righteous phase of it if in any other country the

Rise up Young India.

thing were to happen, you will find all the capitalists concealing themselves in the wine sellars to protect themselves and their property. That is actually happening in Europe at present. I, therefore, beg of you, young men of India, your Motherland is at the present moment lying prostrate, protraste because of your lack of faith in yourselves, in your people and in your country; prostrate because of your weakness of mind and weakness of character. Raise up your minds, enthuse yourselves with the electricity of self-confidence and self-reliance. And this race will rise sphynx like spread all over the world. Remember one-fifth of the human race possessing the intelligence of you, possessing the arms of you, these arms—(pointing out to his arms) not swords and pistols you must be careful in your language, you see. Now our Masters tell us that we are wanting in practical intellect? That subtility which makes two and two appear five. Well. I may tell you that is a dangerous game. If they goad us to-day like that, who knows what Young India may not do? but at the same time I do not want you to make your intellects so subtle as that. I want you to be honest two and two make four men.

Price of Liberty.

I have told you two or three fundamental principles which I believe in. The unity of Hindus and Mahomedans, the belief in yourselves, faith in yourselves, as I call self-faith and the belief that you and you alone shall raise your country. Others can give you crumbs. But they shall not give you soul. What we want is not the crumbs, but the soul. We want the soul of the body politic. And what is the soul of the body politic? Perhaps I am treading on dangerous ground. The soul of the body politic is the power of the purse and the power to defend one's own country. Let me tell you that man is insane who tells you not to take advantage of every opportunity that is offered to you for the service of your country in whatever direction it might lie handy. But let me tell them—they may take it form me that we shall never be contented unless we get Self-Government. Constant, unending, unrestrained, uncontrolled vigil, controlled only by self-discipline, controlled only by righteousness is the price of liberty. Young men of India, are you prepared to pay that price? Do you only say or do you mean it? Well, you shall have it. The moment you mean it, you shall get it. At present you only say 'yes' half-

heartedly. I wish you mean it. (Loud cries of 'we do'). When you mean it, you will get it.

No Submission to force.

I am returning to my country with full faith in the righteousness of my cause. I want you, my countrymen, to work in the open with absolute frankness discarding all secret methods and all methods of violence. If you don't win by soul force, if you don't win by the force of will and determination of three hundred and fifty millions of human beings, we don't deserve to win it by violence. If one-fifth of the humanity cannot win their liberty by the force of their will, by the power of their soul, by the power of their determination, they deserve to be swept off the face of the earth; and no power on earth can save it. Why think of your power? Think of your potentiality. Think of the force in your heart. We need not talk of violence, we need not talk of force. Only cowards do that, not the descendants of ancient Kshatriyas and the descendants of ancient Moghuls. One who is working in the open need not be afraid. I may tell you that the moment I change my opinion, I will give notice to the Government that I have done so. I will never do a thing in the purdah.

We want all women to come out of the purdah and not the men to go into the purdah. No, Sir, that won't do for us. We shall not bring a slur upon the names of our fore-fathers. But subject to that qualification, subject to that reservation, there is nothing on earth, which we shall leave undone, to win our rights and to gain what is ours. We don't want anything which belongs to anybody else. We are prepared to give whenever anybody is in need and wants it in a spirit of proper co-operation. But we shall not give by force. We shall not give by dictation. We will rather not work, we will die in the fields, than let others exploit and take from us what we do not want to give. That is a lesson which I want Young India to lay at heart. My friends, we have talked much, we have talked a lot. We have talked a great deal. There are orators in India, at almost every corner of the streets of Bombay or Calcutta. There are men who in the flow of oratory want to be imperial partners. There are men who are proud of things which ought to put them to shame. But there is an awakening.

The Shrine.

There is a dawn of a new day, the dawn of a new spirit. The year 1919 shall be memorable in the history of

India not for the Reform Act, but for Jallinwallah Bagh. The reforms we shall utilise to the fullest extent. We do not intend to boycot them; as I have told you, it shall be vain to boycot them. We shall utilise every possible avenue, every possible opportunity left to us. To do otherwise would be unwise and insane. But at the same time the Shrine in our hearts which shall live for ever in golden letters shall be Jallianwallah Bagh and not the Reforms. That is the shrine we shall worship and that is the shrine we shall offer flowers at, until that wrong is righted and righted in the right.

Unfounded Aspersions.

As I told you in the beginning of my speech, I come to this country back after six years. I know that sometimes aspersions have been cast upon my work abroad. It is not my purpose to defend myself. I consider it to be beneath my dignity. No one has a right to ask me to give an account of my actions but my countrymen, and when the demand comes from them, I shall tell them everything. I shall conceal nothing because I have nothing to conceal. But in the meantime I, may tell you that not a single pie of any public fund or from any fund taken from any supporters, has been utilised by me for my personal use.

I had plenty of money sent to me by my son and I have lived a frugal life. I may tell you it is no secret —that I disdained to do no work. I have cooked my food with my hands. I have washed my clothes with my hands. I have cleaned my room. I have at times gone with five cents of bread for the evening meal. Not that I had no money. There were thousands of public funds in my hands. But I would not spend one cent of it for myself. I say this not in vindication of my character, but because up to this time I have not heard a single countryman of mine questioning my character in that direction; and as I told you, I owe no apology to anybody else. But I just want to give you this piece of information. In my life from the beginning to the end, I have been entrusted by you with numberless funds. I challenge my bitterest enemies to come forward and say that any action of mine has been effected by any considerations of money or property. I don't want to continue in this strain. It is painful and it is humiliating. But when a man is traduced unfairly, sometimes, he has to speak a word of truth in his own defence.

Be independant.

One last piece of advice that I want to give you is this. Learn to do your work with your hand. Do not depend

upon servants. Do not depend upon property. Do not imitate other people. That will be extremely foolish and suicidal. The more you are free, the more you have the capacity for suffering, the more you have the ability to live a simple life, the more you will be free. Freedom comes from want of independance. Freedom does not come by an act of Parliament. Remember that. If you continue to depend upon your means of livelihood upon this department or upon that department, upon this Honourable or that Honourable, upon this Excellency or that Excellency, you shall always be slaves. But the moment you take the kurhad and go and cut the tree, the moment you take the broom and go and sweep your room, without being tempted with offerings of money and service, you are free, free from all bondages with which you have been afflicted so far. Learn to be free.

Freedom from within.

What is progress? Progress is nothing but progress towards freedom. Your ancestors have taught to you the lesson that freedom is taken away, the moment you have the feeling of dependance. Give up your dependance. Lesson your dependance at any rate, if you cannot give it up. Cultivate the

habit of self-dependance, self-reliance, not in a spirit of aggression or offensiveness but in a spirit of manliness. Manliness of which we have many examples in the History of India; and my friends I tell you, you will never require any speeches to emulate you. You will never require any measures by any body to free you. Freedom must come from within. Freedom must come from the within of the Mother of India. Freedom won't come from without. Freedom won't fall from the Heavens. Freedom will rise Goddess like from our Earth; and we shall rise and with our own hands, we shall offer flowers and we shall worship her.

American Sympathy.*

Lala Lajpat Rai replying to the question of the representative said.

"I can assure you that there is a strong feeling in the States in Political as well as Commercial circles in India's favour." Mr. Lajpat Rai emphasised this point with great vigour and earnestness. One is glad to find that he is as cheerful and as vigorous as ever and appears in robust health. The Americans, he said, all those Americans who are interested in world Politics, are inclined to put the case for Ireland, India and Egypt in the same category.

Ques.—"How do they look upon India's struggle for self-determination asked the representative?"

Ans.—"They are very keen about our work. They want to know more about India. They are prepared to give substantial support to any responsible body of Indians which will tell them what that situation in India really is. We must have a permanent organisation in America manned by some of

* An interview with the Representative of the "Bombay Chronicle."

our first class men—Indians having Political experience and a deep knowledge of our present difficulties and our struggles. The Americans are deeply interested. We have only to look at the recent speeches in the American Senate to be assured of that. Twice the question of India has come up very prominently before the Senate.

Senator France in particular made that time a very important contribution to the debate in our favour."

Ques.—" Which do you think is more important work in England or in America and the Continent ?"

Ans.—" We must spread knowledge about India everywhere. We must, of course, work in England, but I am strongly of opinion that we must supplement this work by an extensive propaganda elsewhere, particularly in America. What they want in America is a dissimination of the facts of the case by us. You must remember that there is a regular British propaganda in America expatiating upon the blessings of British rule. Persons, English and American, helped by certain class of Indians one of their Agents, for example is a Parsee of the name of Rustomjee,—go about telling the Americans that

agitation in India is confined to only a few intellectuals, the discontented lot. These people are evidently supported directly or indirectly by British Agencies. Missionaries, returning to America, are prominent in taking up a hostile attitude to our Political demands. They always bring forward the caste system, the condition of Indian woman and that usual argument about differences between Hindus and Mahomedans as points against us in all their speeches and writings."

Ques.—"Did you receive much help from the Indians at present in America in your work?"

Ans.—"To a very great extent, yes, but one should not depend upon those who are merely students there sent out from this country. They are busy naturally with their immediate work and they do not have time to study the facts of the case. What we want is experienced men, Indians conversant with public life and movements in this country to go out to America and work there. The need for such work is very serious and very urgent. America is anxious to know more about India, to learn more about our demands and Americans sympathise with our case. That is why we must redouble our efforts."

Co-operation—A Conundrum in Psychology.*

I have always believed that there can be no co-operation between a foreign government and the leaders of a subject race. The co-operation of a "conquered race" in the work of administering a "conquered" country is practically an admission of the right of the conquerors to rule the conquered territory. Such an admission is very damaging to the psychology of the conquered race. A conquered race may not be in a position to refuse to co-operate altogether. There are certain departments of administration in which co-operation is unavoidable. There are certain other departments, however, where the ideas of co-operation should be repugnant to the sense of self-respect of the leaders of the subject race. It is a duty of such leaders to keep the flame of liberty alive, by refusing to co-operate with the administration of the conquerors in such a way as to identify themselves with the administration. Consequently I have held all my life that the best brains and the best minds of the nation should not lend their co-operation to the Government by accepting its

* Lala Lajpat Rai explains his position with regard to non-co-operation with the Government of the Punjab in a letter published in the "Tribune" (Lahore) on 3rd July last.

service, and that they should not serve on the legislatures of the country as long as there was a majority of foreigners in it and as long as they had not a determining voice in the legislation of the country.

I have always been of opinion that the presence of Indian members of the Legislative Councils has done more harm to the country than good. Mr. Gokhale co-operated in passing the Press Act. Pandit Malaviya co-operated in passing the Defence of India Act. The Nationalist members co-operated in sanctioning the gift of 100 million pounds towards the expenses of the great war. These, and other similar measures, have in my opinion done greater harm to the country than the combined services of the Indian members of the Legislative Councils for the last 12 years. So far the Indian members have failed to influence the legislatures of the country in the fundamentals of government policy. The finance and the military are the two pivots of the Government. Under both heads the Indian members have egregiously failed to influence Government policy. Their co-operation has been more harmful than their absence in the councils could have been. The attitude of the Government in the matter of Rowlatt Act shows what value Government has attached to their co-operation in spite of all that they had done for the Government during

the war and in spite of the pronouncement of August 1917. The fact is that there can be no co-operation between the members of a nation who has no voice in the selection of the Government and the latter. It is a part of statesmanship to clothe absolutism with the appearance of co-operation, but it is also part of true patriotism not to be misled by these appearances. In my judgment a member of a subject race who strengthens the hands of its absolute rulers, however, pure his motive, is unconsciously guilty of betraying his people. Under certain circumstances, perhaps, it is unavoidable, for example where the subject is called upon to make a choice between two evils, viz., the Government of the ruling race in power, and the Government of another race that threatens to supplant the former. That is one illustration, there may be others too. But when the leaders of a subject race start to co-operate voluntarially and willingly, in the maintenance of a system of Government which denies them their fundamental rights as human beings, such leaders thereby lay themselves open to the charge of being untrue to the best interests of the country.

Such was my position up to the announcement of August 1917. The announcement brought a hopeful

change in this attitude. I could honestly, without outraging my sense of patriotism offer co-operation in working out a scheme which promised complete freedom to my country at no distant date. For the first time in the history of the British administration the people were given the right of administering certain departments of administration through popularly-elected members; and I thought here was a promise which it was the duty of every Indian patriot to utilise in the best interests of his country. I was not enthusiastic over the Reforms Act. I could not be. I could not shut my eyes to its halting nature and its limitations, yet I resolved to honestly co-operate with the Government in the successful working out of the Reforms Scheme. I can never think of "co-operation with the object of non-co-operation." I never intended to co-operate with the object of defeating the Act. I believed that the Act gave us an opening and we should use it frankly and whole-heartedly. I was fully prepared for co-operation.

That was the frame of my mind until I began to feel that both the Government of India and the Secretary of State were engaged in undoing what had been done, or what had been promised by the

Reforms Scheme. In my judgment the policy of the Secretary of State in adding to the strength of the European servants, in increasing enormously the expenditure on those servants, in adding to the military burdens to the country has been throughout dishonest. In his anxiety to placate the Europeans, the Secretary of State has decreed the failure of the scheme. The position of the European servants under the scheme is much stronger, much more paying, and much more effective than it was before the scheme. The policy of the Secretary of State has created a position which means constant friction between honest Indian politicians and the European servants of the Government. Whatever doubt was left in my mind has been completely shattered by the report of the Hunter Committee, and the orders of the Government of India and the Secretary of State thereupon. I do not charge the European members of the Hunter Committee with dishonesty. In my judgment that was the only view of the situation it was possible for them to take on the principle on which the Government of India has been run and is being run now. If you once concede that European supremacy is essential and must be maintained at any cost, and under any circumstances, you are irresistibly led to the conclusion that any thing which

leads to undermine the prestige and authority of the handful of Europeans as governing this country must be an act of open rebellion. Under such a conception of government the fundamental rights of the people are nothing, and at best only secondary. The first test to be applied, in judging a situation is, does the situation lead to the lowering of the prestige and the authority of the European minority ?" If it does, it is an act of "rebellion." What would ordinarily be rioting in England where the people have got fundamental rights, might be rebellion in India. Now the whole of this conception is based on the race superiority of the English, upon their right to rule this country even against the wishes of the people and of their right to maintain their authority in defiance of the unanimously expressed wishes of the latter. Who can say that when the Government of India decided to pass the Rowlatt Bill in defiance of the wishes of the people, the continuation of the agitation against it on such a scale as to make it possible for the disorderly element of the nation to commit rioting, was not an "act of rebellion" according to the conception of the Hunter Committee majority ? The minority has on the other hand judged the situation from the strict legal standard, and on the principle conceded by the Reform Scheme.

The acceptance of majority report by the Government of India and Secretary of State is a virtual denial of the principle on which the Reforms Scheme is based. It is practically a confirmation of the continuation of the old regime. This is specially so, when we consider what is actually happening in the Punjab. The officers who committed atrocities are still occupying positions of trust and confidence in the Punjab administration. They influence Government policy in every department of life. They support only those of the Indians who side with them whatever their character, whatever their ability and whatever their moral standard. What is the result ? Men who have been openly charged with corruption and bribery, whose conduct in the Martial Law administration has been openly challenged by specific allegations of their guilt, and of acts of bribery have been promoted by the Punjab Government; complaints against them are hushed; no effort is being done to bring them to justice or to show any mark of disapproval of their conduct. It is true that the Government of Sir Edward Maclagan has given a fairly good latitude to the educated community in the matter of carrying on their agitation. The Lieutenant-Governor has kept his head on his shoulders and has not allowed himself to be dominat-

ed by hysteria, nay, he has made some laudable efforts towards conciliation. For all that, credit is due to him, but there is no fundamental change in the policy of the Government and in the mentality of the bureaucracy. Look at any department of public administration and you will find defiance of public opinion written on its very portals. Even in the department of commerce and industries the administration does not care a pin for public sentiments, the comfort and convenience of Indians, and the interests of the Indian trade. Even the railways are being run in the interests of the European trade. Look at the police. Never was curruption so strongly entrenched in the police department as now. I do not want to advance a sweeping charge against a department which is so essential for the safety and convenience of the people. But I say it with all sincerity, that within the last 8 years bribery and corruption, intimidation and extortion have established themselves to a much greater extent than before. I can say from personal observation that the police conduct of the political cases before 1914 was much purer (if any such thing could be said of it) than it has been since the advent of Sir Michael O'Dwyer. There was more fear of God and of Government and of public opinion in the mind of the subordinate police

than there has been under the regime of Sir Michael O'Dwyer. I find that Sir Edward Maclagan has done nothing to purge the administration and until this is done there is no chance of the administration being purified and the Reforms Scheme having the least ghost of a chance of fulfilling its purpose.

The bureaucracy relies on honours and supports those who, they believe, stood by them during the last disturbances, never mind how corrupt and immoral they may be. The educated leaders are held in suspicion and ridicule is heaped on them whenever possible.

The member of the bureaucracy and their chief organ, the "Civil and Military Gazette" are not sorry even for the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre. They justify and defend the ill-treatment of the leaders and the bomb throwing at Gujranwala. The Chief Secretary has returned to the field of operations and Col. O'Brien is still one of the pillars of the Administration. How then is it possible for any honest Congressman to co-operate with the bureaucracy in the work of administration? The bureaucracy is determined to defeat the Reform and the Secretary of State has placed them in a position to do so successfully. In my judgment it is absolute folly to

make ourselves even partially responsible for this inevitable failure. The best thing is to keep away and share no responsibility.

I personally do not believe in entering the Legislative Council with the express object of defeating the Reforms Scheme or of obstructing the Government or even of denying my co-operation in measures which are only incidental to the main springs of Government policy. It is not in my nature to be either obstructive or obstinate. In my judgment the task before the new Legislative Councils is almost impossible; there will be even greater temptation, in the way of members, of selling themselves and their conscience. A strong public opinion will be required to check it, if we do not intend that all our public men should be demoralised. Under the circumstances, I think I can be more useful to my country from outside than from within the Council.

As for others, personally I would like that the best Congressmen should abstain. But if the Special Congress decides otherwise and my colleagues choose to go into the councils I will not oppose them nor carry on any agitation against them. My suggestion as to the Defence Committee was conditional, in this sense that if the majority of the Congressmen fall in

with my view the minority could be coerced in that way. But if the majority decide to go for the Council I cannot possibly agitate against them. That is, in short, my position and as soon as my health recover, I intend to revert to the subject again. I have more material with me to show off the mentality of those with whom we are expected to co-operate in the Council Chamber.

P. S.—Permit me to add the following post script to the statement of my position, which I had sent to you early yesterday. I may add for the information of your readers that the "Amrita Bazaar Patrika" and the "Independent" of Allahabad have supported my position. Even the "Marhatta" supports it in a way, exhorting all Congressmen to consider the matter well and decide in the Special Session of the Congress.

(2) The position in the Punjab stands thus. The members of the Punjab Bureaucracy and the non-official Europeans in the Punjab who are likely to get into the Council believe that there was a rebellion in the Punjab last year, that, that rebellion was incited and set on foot by the leaders of the educated community (Messrs. Harkishen Lal, Rambhaj Dutt

Chaudhry, Duni Chand, Drs. Kichlew and Satyapal, the lawyers of Gujranwala among others), that these persons were guilty of waging war against the King and well-deserved all the humuliations and punishment to which they were subjected, that the shooting at Jallianwala, the throwing of bombs at Gujranwala, the floggings at Lahore, Kasur, Amritsar and Gujranwala were generally inflicted rightly and were necessary for the restoration of peace, that the conduct of General Dyer and Col. O'Brien Captain Doveton, Major Boseworth Smith, Lala Siri Ram and others was not only commendable but such as entitles them to our gratitude, that Sir Michael O'Dwyer and General Dyer between themselves saved not only the Punjab but India.

On all these points and many others the educated Indians and the Indian public hold diametrically opposite view. How these people of diameterially opposite views can co-operate to make the new scheme a success is a conundrum in psychology, which I will ask you to solve for us in continuation of the articles you have been writing for our benefit.

The Problems of the Future.*

Chairman of the Reception Committee, Sister and Brother Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen.—My first duty is to tender to you my most cordial thanks for the high honour you have done me in calling me to this office, the highest in your gift and at a Session which is perhaps the most momentous in the history of our movement. The honour is the greater because the Session is being held at Calcutta, a place which has always been associated in my mind with the best and the truest ideals of Indian Nationalism. It was at Calcutta that the first important political movement of the last century was ushered into existence. and it was a Calcutta orator, the greatest that the country has so far produced under the British Rule, who was the first standard-bearer of political agitation all over Northern India. It was at Calcutta that the ideals of the new Nationalism that has since then grown into a mighty tree, were first expounded and esplained by one of the purest minded and the most intellectual of Bengal's gifted sons, I mean Sri Arabindo Ghosh. It was at Calcutta again that the

* The presidential address of Lala Lajpat Rai at the Special Session of the Congress held at Calcutta.

Grand Old Man of India, the revered and universally respected Dadabhai Naoroji, set the ideal of Swaraj before us in clear and unambiguous language, an ideal which has since guided us in all our political endeavours.

A Great Struggle.

It was with great reluctance that I made up my mind to accept the call of duty to which the All-India Congress committee by its decision invited me. Our politics are no more of the old hum drum kind, about which practically there was no, or if at all very little difference of opinion. We are no longer contented with rosolutions, prayers and memorials. We have advanced beyond the last stage of very humble submission, have crossed the boundaries of respectful demand, and have entered into the arena of backing our demands by vigorous and compelling action of a peaceful kind. The country is at the present moment in the throes of a momentous struggle. The Anglo-Indian Press has designated it as revolutionary. There are many people to whom the word 'revolution' is like a red rag to a bull. I am not one of them. Words do not scare me. It is no use blinking the fact that we are passing through a revolutionary period, nay, we are already in the grip

of a mighty revolution, a comprehensive and all-covering one, religious, intellectual, moral, educational, social, economic and political. We are by instinct and tradition averse to revolutions. Traditionally, we are a slow-going people ; but when we decide to move, we do move quickly and by rapid strides. No living organism can altogethor escape revolutions in the course of its existence. Our national history records many such. But the revolutionary struggle through which we are now passing has been brought to our shores by our rulers. It is they who completely changed, without our consent and sometimes against our wishes, the whole structure of our social life by introducing revolutionary economic changes in the country. We never asked for them, we never desired them ; but primarily in their own interests and for their own benefit they introduced them. Along with these economic changes, they have partially, if not completely, changed our outlook on life by their system of education, by their newspapers, by their laws and by their Courts. Some of these changes we would very much like to undo, but whether we or even they can do so now is at best problematic. Any way, the present political situation is a natural outcome of their own policy and is their own handi-work. If, then, any one is to

be blamed for it, (I for one do not blame any one), it is they themselves. Many of them would probably like to set the hands of the clock back ; but it is no longer in their power nor is it in ours to do so. We are following a course which we shall have to keep to, and whether we wish it or not, we are, I repeat, in the thick of a great struggle, the end of which no one can foresee. The better mind of the country is opposed to the use of any kind of violence, whether of language or of deed, in bringing the struggle, to a satisfactory close ; we are doing our level best sincerely and honestly to achieve our end by peaceful means and with the sincerest desire to keep our connection with the ruling race on a basis of mutual friendship and reciprocal interest. But there are persons among the latter who are bent upon thwarting us, who professedly and openly claim their right to rule us by the sword, and who maintain that they have a right to exploit us by all the means available to them by virtue of their military and intellectual power. We are thus face to face with a great struggle between the forces of democratic change, English and Indian, and reactionary militarism. In order to go through the struggle successfully, we will require all the manliness and strength, all the wisdom and tact and all the determination and

strength we are capable of putting forth. Above all, what we need most is calmness and coolness of judgment, moderation in language and firmness in action.

Lok. Bal Gangadhar Tilak.

At such a time and under such circumstances, the loss of a leader like the late lamented Lokamanya Bal Gangadar Tilak is a misfortune and a calamity, the magnitude of which it is difficult to encompass by words. Just when we had the greatest need of his unswerving loyalty and steadfast devotion to the cause of his country, his cool and calm judgment, his unfaltering and firm patriotism, an inscrutable Providence has snatched him from us. The universal grief which this sad event has evoked, and the unique demonstrations which have followed his death throughout the length and breadth of this vast sub-continent, have been a revelation both to his friends and foes. This extraordinary manifestation of popular feeling is almost unparalleled in the history of India. All sections of the people, regardless of caste, creed and colour, regardless of social, religious and political divisions, regardless of economic distinctions have taken part in it, and have given conclusive proof, if any was needed, that in estimating the worth of its leaders and its

servants, the country knows its mind and has no inclination of allowing its judgment to be affected by the wishes and opinions of the highest amongst the dignitaries of the State. Here and there a few mean attempts were made to insinuate that the deceased leader was anti-Muslim, but our Muslim fellow country-men have been the most forward and the most fervent in their expressions of their regard and love for him. Some members of the ruling class, too, have behaved with admirable judgment. Great as has been the loss of the country generally, the loss of the Indian National Congress is even greater. The congress has by his death lost one of its few surviving founders, one who by his indomitable will and energy and his unique sacrifices and sufferings had contributed most to the building-up of that life in the country which finds its expression in the present activities of this National movement. It will be one of the first items of business of this Session to put on record in befitting language our sense of the great and irreparable loss we have suffered by the death of Lokamanya Tilak.

National Problems.

This Session of the congress has been convened in accordance with an understanding arrived at between the leaders

at the Amritsar Congress, for the purpose of considering the Hunter Committee Report and the decision of the Government thereupon relating to the Punjab disturbances of the last year. Since the Amritsar Congress finished its labours, another important question has been added to our National problems, which requires a speedy and immediate consideration both in the interests of peace and good Government. The disappointment which has been caused to our Muslim countrymen by the Turkish Peace Treaty and its effects on the Khilafat is keen and bitter. Lastly, there is the important question of Reforms Rules on which the success of the Reforms, such as they are, so largely depends. The All-India Congress Committee, therefore, have added the Khilafat question and also the rules and regulations under the Reforms Act, to the subject for which originally according to the understanding at the Amritsar Congress this Session was to be convened. These, then, are the three subjects which will be before you during this Sessions for consideration and decision.

Punjab Disorders.

Taking the Panjab disorders first, since we met last at Amritsar, the Congress Commissioners appointed by the Punjab enquiry Sub-Committee of the All-India

Congress Committee have issued their report. The Hunter Committee appointed by the Government of India have also finished their labours and published their report, and the Government of India and British Cabinet have passed their orders on that report. The report of the Hunter Committee is not unanimous. All the Indian members have differed from the majority on matters which, in my judgment, are "basic." Similarly, the Government of India also are not unanimous. The only Indian member of the Government of India (at the time) has accepted the conclusions of the minority and differed from the majority.

Sir M. O'Dwyer Principally Responsible.

To arrive at a proper understanding of the position, one has to look into a whole lot of circumstances which proceded the agitation against the Rowlatt Act and to bear in mind that the person who is principally responsible for the Punjab tragedy, the man whose general policy created the atmosphere which made it possible for a Dyer, a Bosworth Smith an O'Brien, a Doveton, a Frank Johnson and other smaller fry, to commit the unmentionable outrages of which they were guilty in the five days immediately preceding the introduction of Martial Law, and all

through its continuance, in the spring of 1919 in the Punjab, is Sir M. O'Dwyer. From the very moment he took charge of the Province he set before him an ideal of Government which was Prussian in conception, Prussian in aim and Prussian in execution. For six long years he occupied himself in working out his ideals and in carrying out his plans. Every item was carefully thought out, and with equal care entrusted to agents who were more fitted and willing to achieve the end desired by the head of the Government. If ever there intervened an obstacle or a hindrance it was removed without the least pang of conscience, andwithout the slightest consideration of its morality or even legality, so much so that even the European members of the I. C. S., who refused to endorse his opinions or to carry out his mandate, had to retire into the back-ground.

Punjab Administered on Military lines.

To the misfortune of Punjabees, the Punjab happens to be practically a military Province on account of its nearness to the Frontier, and because of their being so many military stations in the vicinity of the most important civil stations. The Punjab Commission has, besides, always had on its personnel, a good many representatives of the

military service. The Punjab bureaucracy has thus been more or less always dominated by military ideals, and the civil administration of that Province has never been absolutely free from military influence. The civillians, living in or in the vicinity of military stations and passing about six months in the year in hill stations where the military predominate, are consciously or unconsciously affected by the opinions and views of their military fellow-officers. No wonder then that in spite of the lavish praises bestowed on the Punjabees by the Anglo-Indian administrators, and in spite of the most extravagant solicitude shown by them in words for the prosperity of the Punjab, the bulk of the Punjabis are the most ignorant and the most abjectly situated of all the peoples of India. It is extremely painful specially for a Punjabi to say that under and in consequence of British rule, the manly races of the Punjab should have lost that independence of character and bearing for which they had a name in Indian history prior to British rule. It will be no exaggeration to say that for military reasons the bureacracy has kept the Martial races of the Punjab ignorant and in a condition of submissiveness bordering on abject servility. The Punjabis are reputed to have a splendid physique. The rural Panjab is the nursery of the flower of

British Indian army. Even urban Punjab has a population which is physically superior to the similarly placed people of other parts of India ; yet it is remarkable that whenever Plague and Influenza have attacked the Province, The Punjabis have been the most willing to die in entirely disproportionate numbers. One may naturally ask, why ? The answer is because of the dense ignorance of the Punjab masses, because of the lack of the adequate medical staff, because of inadequate measures of sanitation and last but not least, because of the lack of that political consciousness which makes men self-reliant and self-respecting. The exigencies of militarism have inspired the policy of keeping the Punjab peasantry illiterate as well as politically Dumb. But for the strength of character shown by some of Sir Michael O'Dwyer's predecessors in the office of the Lieutenant-Governor, particulary Sir C. Aitchison and Sir Dennis Fitz Patrick, the Punjab would have been in a still worse position.

Advent of Sir M. O'Dwyer.

The policy of militarism, however, reached its climax with advent in the Province of Sir M. O'Dwyer. Sir M. O'Dwyer who had been absent from the Province for about 15 years, having originally served there in

minor capacities, returned as the head of the Government with a determination to crush the spirit which had made 1907 and 1910 possible. In 1913 when he took charge of the Province the people had considerably changed from what they had been when he was last there. They were not so very submissive and there was a little political awakening also. To crush this political awakening was one of his principal aims. So when he returned he set before him as his ideal a Prussian system of administration. All through the period of his office he was guided by that ideal.

Charges Against Sir M. O'Dwyer.

(1) I charge him with having deliberately intensified the policy of 'divide and rule', by keeping apart the Mahomadans from the Hindus and both from the Sikhs.

(2) I charge him with having created fresh political divisions between the people of the province by drawing purely artificial and mischievous distinctions between martial and educated classes and between the rural and urban interests and creating unhealthy rivalry between them.

(3) I charge him with having made illegal use of the processes of law and of his authority for

recruitment purposes, and for getting contributions for the War Loan and other war funds.

(4) I charge him with having condoned and in a way encouraged the most brutal and diebalic deeds of those who were his tools in recruiting and War Loan campaigns and with having failed to check bribery and corruption among the subordinate Police and Magistracy.

(5) I charge him with having debased and misused the forms and processes of law for the purpose of crushing those who would not bend his knee to him and who showed the slightest independence of spirit and a desire for political advancement.

(6) I charge him with having deliberately deceived the Government of India as to the necessity of Martial Law, and as to the necessity of trying cases of ordinary sedition under the processes of that law. He was guilty of a clear falsehood at this stage when he suggested to the Government of India that the General Officer Commanding in the Panjab agreed with his views.

(7) I charge him with having deliberately manipulated the continuance of Martial Law, for

vindictive and punitive purposes when there was no rebellion and there was no likelihood of a recrudescence of disturbance in that province.

(8) I charge him with having been instrumental by express or tacit consent and by encouragement, by word or deed, in the promulgation of barbarous orders and the infliction of barbarous punishments and humiliations on the people of the Punjab.

(9) I charge him at least with being an accessory after the event of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. By his unqualified approval of the Jallianwala massacre he made himself responsible for all the outrages committed by the Martial Law administrators in pursuance of his policy.

(10) I charge him with having connived at perfectly illegal exactions from the people of the Punjab in the shape of punitive fines and penalties.

(11) I charge him with culpable neglect of duty in not going to Amritsar, first on the 11th after the deplorable events of the 10th, and then on the 14th after the massacre at the Jallianwala Bagh.

(12) I charge him, lastly, with having extorted addresses from the people of the Punjab, on the

eve of his departure by illegal and mean threats, one of them having been altered in a material particular when in the custody of his minions, and having made a dishonest use of them in his defence in England.

These are serious charges, and I bring them with all the weight of the office to which you have raised me with the common consent of the country, I challenge an enquiry and I declare before God and man that my province and my people will not be satisfied until such an enquiry has been made.

Evidence in Support of Charges.

I will now proceed to refer briefly to the evidence in support of these charges, and for that purpose we have to go so far back as the beginning of his regime. As soon as he took charge of his office he was evidently told that the prestige of the Government in the Province had gone low, and had suffered by the policy of weakness and softness followed by his predecessors. So he made up his mind to destroy what he considered to be the root cause of the evil, *viz.*, the influence of the new ideas of independence and advancement that had taken partial hold on the minds of the people by the spread

of education and by other causes and initiated a new policy of "no damned nonsense," of teaching the Indians to keep their proper places and of letting the educated community realise that he was the Government, that his order was law, and that his wish was supreme. The first thing he did was to place his personality on a much higher and sacred plane than had been attempted by any of his predecessors. He started holding Darbars, and expecting Nazars, even on occasions on which no Nazars had been presented before his time. For example, it was customary for the Premier Municipality of the Province to present an address of welcome to every new Leiutenant-Governor on his taking charge of the province. It was customary for the members of the Municipality to be presented to the Lieutenant-Governor on these occasions, who shook hands with them, and, if possible, spoke a kind word to each. Even the Prince of Wales, the present king, shook hands with them on his visit. No Nazars were ever presented to the Lieutenant-Governor on these occasions, but when the Municipal Committee of Lahore, of which I was a member at that time, communicated to Sir M. O'Dwyer their desire of presenting an address of welcome, the procedure ordered was different. He ordered a public

Darbar for the purpose and managed to send word to the members of the Municipal Committee that they would be expected to present Nazars. I with two or three of my colleagues decided to convey to the authorities that we would rather absent ourselves than submit to this innovation. The Nazars thus had to be dispensed with, and we attended the function. There for the first and the last time in my life I was face-to-face with Sir M. O'Dwyer, who sat in the dais like a de-humanised stone statue devoid of any human sentiments or feelings. The address was read to him by the Deputy Commissioner-President of the Municipal Committee. It was a colourless address. So the reply was colourless too. Finally, the members were presented to him one by one from the floor and I am not sure whether any of them received the courtsy of even a nod.

First Utterance: Self-Government An Abstract Speculation

The Province was at that time perfectly tranquil except that there was as usual some violent crime in the Frontier Districts. No political activities of any kind were in evidence. Yet Sir M. O'Dwyer thought it necessary as early as August 1913 (he took charge on the 26th May) to

make the following observation in one of his earliest public utterances in the province:

"During the short time I have held charge of this province, I have received many excellent and well-meant suggestions as to how I should carry on the administration, what I should do to meet the aspirations of the people, to further the movement towards Self-Government, towards the separation of executive and judicial functions, and in regard to other matters of State policy. Abstract speculations of this nature have their interest and value, though they would gain in value, if in addition to enforcing the duties of the administration, some stress were laid on the elementary duties of the people as citizens and subjects. I should have welcomed, and I shall welcome, any practical suggestion as to how Government can disharge more efficiently its primary obligation to secure life and property, and how the people can be aroused to a sense of their duty towards the community. All other questions of policy are, in my opinion, subsidiary to those two, and should stand over till these obligations are adequately discharged."

All questions of Self-Government, as well as those relating to the separation of judicial from

executive functions were "abstract speculations" in his eyes and subsidiary to the greater duty of securing life and property. Reading his speech, one would think that after 64 years of continuous British rule, life and property were not secure in the Punjab in 1913, at the time of His late Honour's taking charge of the office of the Lieutenant-Governor.

Restrictions on the Liberty of the Press.

In the same speech he also gave a warning to the Vernacular press which was followed by immediate action under the Press Act. Securities were demanded from newspapers. Those already deposited were forfeited in certain cases. Again in the very first speech he made as President of the Punjab Legislative Council a month later, he emphasized this policy by the following observation :—

"If the action already taken did not have the desired effect, Government will deal with the offenders as with any other individuals that break the law by promoting disorder or disaffection, and will employ all the means the law places at its disposal, and of these the taking and forfeiting of the security are the least."

He was true to his word. During the six years of his administration he did all he could to strangle

the Press and to deprive it of the least vestige of independence, although he added that "mutual confidence and intimate association of the administration and the people had always been a marked feature in this Province"—words which, in the light of events which have happened since, were only meant to conceal the real state of affairs.

Banking Crisis.

In September of the same year came the Banking crisis, which benumbed and paralysed the industrial and commercial life of the Province, and affected a very large number of people, amongst them many widows and orphans. The banking crisis was brought about by an unholy alliance of the officials of the Punjab Government and some personal enemies of Lala Harkishan Lal, the chief figure in the then industrial life of the Punjab. I was at that time on the Directorate of the Punjab National Bank, the only Indian Bank that survived that crisis, and had by personal knowledge, opportunities of observing how frequently those Indians who had engineered the crisis, waited upon a certain official representative of the Punjab Government. The Punjab Government did practically nothing to relieve the sufferings that were caused by the crisis and, when the Punjab

National Bank applied to the Government for an assurance of help in case of need, they sent a reply that large sums of money had been placed at the disposal of the Bank of Bengal to give relief when and where needed. The Punjab National Bank then applied to the Bank of Bengal for similar assurance, offering Government Promissory notes as security, which they flatly declined to give. The impression that was left on our minds was that the bureaucracy was very happy at the misfortune that had befallen the Province and that as far as it lay in their power they would do nothing to relieve this distress. While relief was promptly and freely given to European establishments every Indian establishment was allowed to go under for want of timely aid and presumably for "moral effect." There was thus no help but to conclude that it was intended to crush all the industrial and financial enterprise in the Province, with a view to remove any vestige of economic independence that had found expression. The Banking crisis made us realize, as perhaps we had never before realised, the absolute helplessness to which we had been reduced by the present system of Government. We felt the situation keenly which had made it possible for the foreign capitalists to impose upon us not only their system but also

their terms and their business, by the use of the very moneys that were realized from us by the Government in the shape of revenues. When the Industrial Commission visited the Punjab, these and other facts were related to them by Lala Harkishan Lal in his evidence and on some Commissioner reminding him if he realized what he was saying, he replied by an emphatic 'yes.'

"Excellence" of the Punjab System.

It was about this time that Sir M. O'Dwyer read us another sermon on the excellence and efficiency of the Punjab system of administration. In a speech delivered on the 13th of April 1914 with reference to a proposal that an Executive Council be established in the Province, the Lieutenant-Governor took upon himself to rebuke those who were in favour of that proposal in the following language :—

"The proposal had come upon him rather as a surprise. The people of the Province had from the start been habituated to regard the Lieutenant-Governor as the sole head of and in the last degree responsible for the administration of the Province. The Province had progressed and prospered under that system in a manner which can stand comparison with any other province or presidency, and that the

matter could come within the range of practical politics only if it could be shown that the present administration of the Province suffers from certain defects, and that the addition of an executive council would remove those defects."

On this theory no progress and no fundamental change would ever be possible except in cases of proved mis-government. Evidently Sir M. O'Dwyer had never heard the saying that no amount of good government can be a substitute for Self-Government. But was there much of good Government in this case, either? Are not the statement about the progress and prosperity of the Province absolutely unjustified in the light of the general illiteracy prevailing, and the high rate of mortality by Plague and other diseases?

Delhi Conspiracy Trial.

At the same time he gave us an exhibition of his mentality by another incident which did not receive much publicity at that time. In the early part of 1914, began the trial which subsequently became known as the Delhi Conspiracy Case. One of the accused in that case was the eldest son of Lala Hans Raj, who is universally respected and honoured in the Province

for his unique self-sacrifice and for an unbroken record of 30 years of disinterested public service in the cause of education and religious and social reform. Lala Hans Raj never dabbled in politics, but when it was discovered that his son was one of the accused in a case which would involve a considerable expense for the purpose of defence, the people came readily to his help. Large sums of money were offered to him for the defence of his son and also personal offers of professional service were made. He would not and did not accept the former, but accepted the latter from a few friends.

Rebuke to the Hon'ble Lala Kanshi Ram.

One of these friends was the Hon'ble Lala Kanshi Ram, a distinguished Vakil, who undertook to lead the defence for his son. While engaged in this work at Delhi L. Kanshi Ram had to absent himself from one of the meetings of the Punjab Legislative Council. Sir M. O'Dwyer knew the reason of his absence, yet he called for an explanation, and later on through the Secretary of the Legislative Council made him understand that he was displeased with L. Kanshi Ram. Nor was this the only case of its kind. I know from personal knowledge that, as a rule, the senior members of the Bar were from time to time

administrator, and it cannot be said that he failed to make use of them to the fullest extent. How he abused his powers under the Defence of India Act has been stated in the Congress Commissioners' report from which I take the following:—

"He abused the powers given to him by the Defence of India Act by prohibiting the entry into the Province of Messrs. Tilak and Pal. He interned hundreds of local men with little or no cause. He gagged the vernacular press, prevented the nationalist papers edited outside the Punjab from circulating in the Province, as for instance "New India," the "Amrita Bazaar Patrika," and the "Independent." He prohibited the circulation even of precensored vernacular papers, and brought about a state of things, whereby it became practically impossible for the people of the Province to have a free interchange of independent views or free ventilation of their grievances in the public press, and then, having prevented free speech and free writing, allowed himself to think, and gave outsiders to understand that the people of the Punjab were the happiest under his rule.

"Not only did he abuse emergency legislation for the purpose of throttling political aspirations, but he abused his position as a ruler by summoning

public men, using threats and giving them warnings. L. Duni Chand, who has an unbroken record of public service, had personal experience of this part of Sir Michael O'Dwyer's administration. This is what he says in his statement given to us by him :—

"As a secretary of the Indian Asssociation I had to call public meetings, and after the issue of the notices I was called either by the Chief Secretary to Government of the Commissioner of Lahore to see him, and they always put such obstacles in my way of holding public meetings that many persons in my place would have done any thing but held public meetings at Lahore. The Chief Secretary and the Commissioner told me more than once, presumably on behalf of Sir Michael O'Dwyer's administration whom to invite and whom not to invite as speakers from outside the Province.

"Not only this but when some of the member of the Provincial Legislative Council attended the last Provincial Conference at Lahore, these gentlemen were called by the Chief Secretary, and were taken to task in such a way, that they could not have the courage to attend other public meetings in the Bradlaugh Hall."

"In 1917 nineteen members of the Imperial Legislative Council signed their famous memorandum,

setting forth their proposals for reforms. A meeting was held to approve of the scheme. Four of the signatories to the notice of the meeting were Punjab men. He sent for them and administered to them a severe rebuke for having dared to think for themselves and to sign the notice. Then followed the Congress-League Scheme, and he tried his best to wean the Punjab from it, and lost no opportunity of belittling the effort to bring about a hearty union between Hindus and Mahammadans. He dared to confound the issue by comparing the Home rule movement, led by Mrs. Besant and Mr. Tilak, whose goal was attainment of Self-Government within the Empire by constitutional and peaceful means, with the *Ghadr* revolutionists, whose goal was frankly to sever the British connection by violent means, and with the mad people of the South-West Punjab, who desolated many a home by harbouring chimerical views of establishing and Islamic Kingdom through German aid. He put down the Ghadr movement in a merciless manner, and, we fear, not without inflicting injustice on hundreds of innocent men. He affected to consider the pillage of defenceless homes in the South-West Punjab in 1915 by treating the pillage, in the early stage as mere grain riots, and took energetic measures only when his hands were

absolutely forced and when he saw that these depredations were becoming so serious that they might even jeopardise the work of recruiting."

Exclusion of Nationalist Papers.

There are two incidents referred to in these paragraphs which require a little amplification. One relates to the absolutely unwarranted arbitrariness with which he dealt with the press in ordering it not to publish proceedings of a meeting that had been held in the Bradlaugh Hall to protest against the internment of Mrs. Besant. The absurdity of this order dawned on his mind only when the papers from the other Provinces arrived containing an account of the proceedings. The order was then withdrawn and it became necessary for his purpose to exclude from the Province some of the foremost organs of nationalist opinion.

Order against Mrs. Pal and Tilak.

As to the embargo on Messrs. Pal and Tilak he had to defend his position by comparing their propaganda with that of the S.-W. Punjab riots and the *Ghadr* party. In the course of a speech in the Local Council he remarked :—

"Such changes" (as are involved in compliance with the demands of the Home Rulers) "would

be as revolutionary in their character and I believe as subversive of the existing constitution as those which the *Ghadr* emissaries endeavoured to bring about. Indeed it is not without significance to find *that the catch word of the thousands who participated in the dacoities of the South-West Punjab two years ago and of many of the men who fomented the* Ghader *conspiracy the Pacific Coast was Swaraj or Home Rule,* and the hundreds of the emigrants who returned to the punjab to spread rebelion in the Province by fire and sword claimed that their object was to establish Home Rule."

Two big lies (a) South-West riots.

I have italicised certain words in this extract as they contain two statements which the Lieutenant Governor must have known to be false and which he deliberately injected into his speech, to discredit the movement for Home Rule, and to overawe the people of the Punjab by an absolutely unjustifitable comparison between the movement for Home Rule and the other two movements referred to in the lines italicised. The movement in the South-West Punjab which resulted in numerous outrages on defenceless Hindu homes was the direct outcome of the ignorance and inefficiency of the administration, of the impression

created by them that Muhammadans were the favoured of the Government against Hindus, and also of the dense ignorance in which the people of the Province were kept by the denial to them of the benefits of education as well as opportunites for constitutional political propaganda.

People who took part in the riots in the South-West of the Punjab probably had never heard of the Home Rule movement, and it has never been alleged that any of them used that phrase. It is a strong evidence of the inefficiency of Sir Michael O'Dwyer's administration that he and his subordinates at first refused to treat them seriously and insisted on ascribing them to economic reasons by calling them as mere grain riots, and this in face of the opinion of an experienced Police officer to the contrary. No less than 128 crimes of violence were committed in the course of the disturbances, in the districts of Jhang, Multan and Muzaffargarh, between the 22nd of February and the 20th of March, but none of these disturbances were ascribed to the Home Rule movement by Mr. John Coatman, the Police officer referred to above. In his opinion:

"The Muhammadans were able to be persuaded that the British had left India and that they might

fairly take advantage of the state of interregnum until the arrival of the Germans." "It is in these cases that we find the dacoits describing themselves as subjects of the German Emperor and declaring that the British Rule had ceased to exist in India. About two-hundred men took part in this afiair proclaiming themselves subjects of the German Emperor, who, they said, had given them permission to loot as they pleased." "German men went about the neighbouring hamlets and villages informing the Muhammadans that the Germans were within few days' march from Jatoi and that they had received *earte blanche* from the German Emperor to loot and behave as they pleased. Many gangs assembled, the large ones designating themselves 'Black Germans', 'Yellow Germans', 'Red Germans', Green Germans', gang and the like."

It is said in the Administration Report of the Punjab for 1915–16:—

"The dacoities and disorder that occurred in the Jhang. Muzaffargarh and Multan districts in February and March were unprecedented in the annals of the criminal administration of the Province.' The acts of violence included murder, loot, rape, etc.

The facts that emerge out of this incident may be thus summarised,—(*a*) that in spite of all his boasting about the efficiency of the Punjab administration, Sir Michael O'Dwyer and his associates in the work of administration were entirely out of touch will public feeling in the South-West districts, (*b*) that by their inefficiency and exaggerated self-sufficiency they allowed themselves to be taken by surprise, (*c*) that in spite of all resources of modern civilsation at their disposal, *viz.*, a complete system of postal and telegraphic communciations and a complete net work of railways, they let the most fearful outrages be committed on the persons and the property of the Hindus of the *Ilaka* for a period of about a month, and then tried to conceal their inefficiency under a false pretence. (*d*) that even when the true significance of the disorders was made clear to them they never applied for the introduction of Martial Law, and never charged any of the accused with waging war against the King, or conspiring to overthrow his Government. (*e*) According to the Administration Report the maximum sentences ranged from 5 to 7 years only, (in one place it is said, from 5 to 10 years) and out of 4,000 arrested only 700 could be convicted.

I do not suggest that there was any occasion for more drastic measures. Speaking for myself and in your name, I should have as strongly condemned the introduction of Martial Law and the trial of these cases under Martial Law as I emphatically do in the case of the disturbances of last year. Only draw attention to this matter because it is useful to compare the attitude of the Lieutenant-Governor in relation to this affair, with what he subsequently did in 1919. The reasons are obvious. This was a rising of the uneducated people who belonged to the rural classes and Sir Michael O'Dwyer had no bias against them. Besides he had yet the larger part of his term to run before him and was afraid of revenge. Yet he had the check to use this incident for the purpose of preventing leaders of the Home Rule movement from visiting Lahore, Amristar and other such urban areas on the ostensible ground that similar outrages may be encouraged by their propaganda.

(b) Ghadr Conspiracy Case.

Equally unscruplous is the other comparison with the *Ghadr* movement. In the course of the *Ghadr* conspiracy trial, numerous extracts from the *Ghadr* newspaper of San Francisco were put on the record, which

proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that the *Ghadr* leaders aspired and worked for complete independence involving separation of India from the British Empire and the establishment of a Republic; that they preached open rebellion and open war against the British; that they ridiculed and held up to contempt the Home Rule movement and the leaders thereof. Yet in spite of all this, Sir Michael O'Dwyer did not hesitate to say that the *Ghadr* people had used the Home Rule shibboleth for the purpose of a revolution.

Coming to the conspiracy trial, it is not my intention to find fault with the attempt to prosecute and punish the principal offenders, as it is clear that the chief conspirators did come out to India with the express purpose of creating a bloody revolution. But even in the course of this trial we see a fairly good exhibition of Sir Michael O'Dwyer's mind. It expressed itself in the method of investigation as well as in the course of the trial. In investigation the evidence was collected by a discredited Russian method of using *agent provocateurs.* In the trial persons were involved against whom there was practically no evidence. One of such persons was Bhai Permanand, a Master of Arts of the Punjab

University, who had been for some time a Professor of the Dayananda College. His chief offence was that he had written a History of India which was not to the liking of the officials. This good man was sentenced to death on the flimsiest possible evidence by the two European members of the Special Tribunal, the third member, who was an Indian, disagreeing about the sentence. The sentence was confirmed by Sir Michael O'Dwyer, and commuted later of life imprisonment by Lord Hardinge. In the first trial (there were three trials relating to the same conspiracy) the special Tribunal sentenced 24 persons to death, 16 of whom in the opinion of the Viceory did not deserve it. Lord Hardinge took particular care to say in the course of his order that he commuted these sentences not in the exercise of his prerogative, but because the evidence on the record did not justify the sentences. This was a clear censure both on the Tribunal and the Lieutenant-Governor. But Sir Michael O'Dwyer swallowed it quietly.

Speech in Imperial Council for which he had to apologize.

In December 1916 was promulgated the historic Congress-Muslin League Scheme, demanding Self-Government on certain lines. What steps Sir Michael O'Dwyer took to prevent the people of the

Punjab from associating themselves with the Scheme have already been stated above in the words of the Congress Commissioners. But when Sir Michael O'Dwyer was practically certain of having suppressed the political movement in the Punjab by his Prussian methods there came the epoch-making pronouncement of Mr. Montagu, about the future Government of India. This upset all his calculations. He lost his balance of mind. In the course of a speech he was making on the motion of the Hon'ble Mr. Mahomed Shafi asking for the assimilation of the Legislative and Administrative systems in the Punjab with those of the Province of Bihar and Orissa, he created a most undesirable scene. First, he said that in the Punjab the conditions set forth by Mill as indispensible for Self-Government were not likely to be filled for many a long day, then he belauded the Punjah for its services in the war to the disparagement of other Provinces and finally hurled the following insult at the educated classes :—

"In these days when we are in danger of being defended by political harangues and of being blinded by the shower of political manifestoes, it is well occasionally to return to mother earth to clear up our minds of shams and illusions, and to ask

ourselves what will all this noise and talk do for the man on the soil, the man behind the plough, the man whose life is a long drawn question between a crop and a crop."

It was for this speech that he was made to apologize. But a few days later, on the 30th of October, he forgot all about his apology and in another speech made in the Punjab repeated the same sentiments making a further mischevious statement about the claims of the martial classes to the special consideration of the Government as against the educated classes. Notwithstanding the hypocritical solicitude which he professed for "the man on the soil, the man behind the plough and the man whose life is a long drawn question between a crop and a crop," we know how empty were his words. What is the evidence of his beneficence for these classes,—their right to die in extravagant numbers in plague and influenza which practically swept away whole villages, the utter inadequacy of medical relief, the deplorable want of sanitation in villages, their extreme backwardness in education, their helpless submission to the tortures and outrages which his myrmidons committed on them during the recruiting campaign and the progress of the War Loan, includ-

ing many illegal prosecutions that were launched against them. The only tangible form which his solicitude for the martial classes took was the picking out of a number of men from among his creatures, for the grant of titles, *Jagirs*, rewards, grants of lands, etc. How these have helped the man on the soil and the man whose life is a long drawn battle between a crop and a crop is known only to Sir Michael O'Dwyer. In fact these rewards and grants furnish the gravemen of a serious charge against him, viz., (*a*) of misusing public funds and public lands. (*b*) of exalting those whom he had picked up for use against the educated classes of the countrymen so as to create a permanent breach between the different classes of His Majesty's subjects. Evidence of this we find in the statements which some of these proteges of Sir Michael O'Dwyer gave regarding the Reform Scheme wherein they decried the educated classes as "noisy agitators," a favourite expression of Sir Michael O'Dwyer himself so often repeated in his gubernatorial utterances. They newly coined distinction between the rural and the urban classes is another gift of his to the Province.

On page 14 of their Report, the Congress Commissioners have described his memorandum on

the Reform Scheme and have shown how insulting, provocative, unjust and untruthful are his vituperations against the educated classes and their leaders. In a previous speech he had called them "fools." In this memorandum he likens them to "Grasshoppers" particularly pouring his venom on the devoted heads of the leaders of the Home Rule movement, Mrs. Besant, Mr. Tilak, Mr. Jinnah, the Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and the Raja of Mahmudabad by name.

The most importans parts of this memorandum, however, are :—

(*a*) in which he deplores the revival of political agitation in the Punjab caused by the Secretary of State's pronouncement of the 17th August 1917.

Says he :—" Here I may endeavour to explain the curious fact that the Punjab deputations as a whole have shown less hostility to the Congress-League programme or the Home Rule movement than similar bodies in other Provinces (another untruth.)

" The events of 1907, the Delhi Conspiracy case in 1912-14, the *Ghadr* movement in 1914-15,

had shown the dangers of violent political agitation among the many disorderly elements in the Province, and the Punjab Government had even before the outbreak of the war taken strong measures to prevent its spread. The war and the necessity of excluding any influences that would interfere with recruiting made a continuance of that policy essential. Hence the orders passed years ago to exclude Messrs. Tilak and Pal, who were about to undertake a Home Rule propaganda in the Province, and other similar measures. *That action had the approval and support of the great mass of the people, and till a few months ago political agitation was at a discount in the Province. Even the Secretary of State's announcement in August* 1917 *caused little stir.*" (The italics are mine).

"The proceedings of September last in the Simla Council, the release of Mrs. Besant, the attitude of the Government of India in the simultaneous examination and in other debates, were however interpreted to mean that the Government of India would not allow Local Government to interfere with their policy of conciliating the extermists. The small section of advanced politicians in the Punjab, hitherto quiscent, were encouraged to assert themselves, and to come into line with other provinces.

Local branches of the Congress sprung into life and renewed their activity, and the invitation to frame political programme for the Secretary of State's visit furnished them with a *raison detre*. This was all natural and reasonable."

The statement that his action against Messrs. Tilak and Pal *had the approval and support of the great mass of the people* is of course wholly and demonstrably untrue.

(*b*) His machiavellian wish to use one religion or one political party against the other.

Says he :—" If, however, the system advocated in the report is adopted, there are advantages as well as risks in having more than one Minister. The risk that they might overawe the Indian member of Council is greater if there are two or three than if there is only one. On the other hand, if there are more Ministers than one, it is unlikely that they will all belong to the same religion, or the same political party, and each would act as a *counterpoise to his colleagues.* The Lieutenant-Governor thinks on the whole that if political rather than financial considerations are to prevail the advantage is on the side of plurality." The italics are again mine.

Political activities in the Punjab.

But however much he disliked the pronouncement of 1917, it was the scheme eventually propounded by Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford which excited his utmost indignation. What exasperated him most was the fact that in spite of all that he had done to crush political life in the Punjab the educated classes still dared to raise their heads and carry on their agitation. They held public meetings at Lahore. They convened a Provincial Conference and passed resolutions. They attended in fairly large numbers the meetings of the Congress at Bombay and Delhi, and lastly they invited the Congress to Amritsar. They decided to hold a Provincial Conference at Jullundur, elected Mr. Harkishan Lal to the office of President and also nominated him a member of the Congress Deputation that was going to England to press for changes in the Reform Scheme. The whole of Sir Michael's policy in April and May 1919 was directed to prevent this from taking place and to make it impossible for the Punjab ever in future to do such things. It was necessary for him to do so in order to prove that the statements he had made about the political unfitness of the people of the Punjab were true. The agitation against the Rowlatt Act gave the opportunity,

and as he was about to leave the Province for good, he wanted to make the best use of the short time before him. The first thing he did was to silence the leaders who had invited the Congress to Amritsar. They were Dr. Kitchlew and Pandit Kotu Mal. Dr. Satyapal was closely associated with them. The following questions and answers extracted from the evidence of Mr. Miles Irving (the then Deputy Commissioner of Amritsar), support my contention:—

Q.—Was there an All-India Congress down to be held in Amritsar ?

A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—When was that to come off ?

A.—It was to come off about now, in October or November.

Q.—And did that circumstance bring into prominence the Local Congress Committee ?

A.—Yes, Sir, it did. They were naturally busily engaged in the organisation and it also was a circumstance uniting Muhammadans and Hindus in politics.

Q.—As regards the Local Congress Committee, had it an Executive Committee ?

A.—An Executive Committee of six.

Q.—Any of those six have been tried ?

A.—Two were put on trial.

Q.—Who were those two ?

A.—I am afraid I cannot remember now.

Order against Dr. Satyapal.

The first step was to silence Dr. Satyapal. On the 29th of March orders under the Defence of India Act were served on him preventing him from speaking in public. There was no disturbance of any kind on the 30th March. There was a meeting on the 2nd of April, in which, according to Mr. Miles Irving's testimony, the principal speaker advised the people to abstain from acts of violence :—

Q.—What effect did that have on the community at Amritsar ?

A.—The effect, as it appeared to me, was manifested in a meeting on April the 2nd in which one Swami Satya Dev came down and advised against violence for the present. He seemed, as the report reached me, to hold out a prospect in future when, as he said, people would go to jail in thousands, foreshadowing, as I understand, some form of concerted action under orders to paralyse Government. But his immediate advice to the people was to abstain from all acts of violence till that time.

Dr. Kitchlew.

On the 4th of April similar orders were served on Dr. Kitchlew and Pandit Kotu Mal. These orders emanated from the Punjab Government, and they were implicitly obeyed. We have the statement of Mr. Miles Irving that between the 4th and the 9th April nothing happened which could be formed the basis of any action against them :—

Q.—I just want to know, so far as your knowledge goes, if you can inform this Committee as to whether anything specially objectionable was said or done between the 29th March and 10th April by Dr. Kitchlew to justify the order of deportation ?

A.—He practically ordered the *hartal* of the 6th. That is one thing.

Q.—And anything else ?

A.—I cannot think of anything else.

Q.—And you are quite certain that so far as the orders go he did not intend to contravene them ?

A.—I had no case for taking action against him in any way.

Yet on the 10th of April Drs. Kitchlew and Stayapal were arrested for deportation under an order for which the sole responsibility rests on Sir Michael O'Dwyer as Mr. Miles Irving is positive that he had no hand in that order. He neither suggested nor recommended the deportation order.

Sir M. O'Dwyer responsible for deporting Drs. Kitchlew and Satyapal.

Q.—You have already informed this Committee that you did not suggest or recommend the deportation of Drs. Satyapal and Kitchlew?

A.—It was not my suggestion.

In fact on a previous occasion he had intervened in favour of Dr. Kitchlew. The Minority of the Hunter Committee have remarked (page 113) that Mr. Kitchin, the Commissioner of Lahore and Amritsar, said that there was no anti-British feeling before the 10th of April, and Mr. Miles Irving has expressed the same view. The majority after discussion of the event that led to the passing of the deportation order (page 20 and 21) also supports that conclusion. It will thus be seen that the order of deportation against Drs. Kitchlew and Satyapal, for which Sir Michael O'Dwyer alone was responsible, was the real beginning and the root cause of all

the trouble that ensued at Amritsar on the 10th, and in the rest of the Punjab after that. Sir Michael O'Dwyer is then the person who is responsible for all the bloodshed that occurred in the Punjab in the month of April. His action was both malicious and rash. It was malicious, because it emanated from the desire to punish Dr. Kitchlew for having invited the Congress to the Punjab and thereby prevent the session being held there. It was rash, because he had apparently failed to keep himself in touch with the popular feeling in the Punjab and based his order on the expectation that the people would not resent it, as is evidenced by the general trend of Mr. Miles Irvings' statement about this.

Both the *hartals*, that of the 30th March and of the 6th April, had passed off peaceably. If Sir Michael O'Dwyer had not deported Drs. Kitchlew and Satyapal and had not passed the order he did against Mr. Gandhi, the country would have been saved all the misery and bloodshed that followed the passing of these orders. These orders were entirely unjustified and unnecessary. The Local officers had not asked for them. No facts have been alleged to show that the situation in the Punjab was in any way serious or more serious than anywhere else. The

Chief Commissioner of Delhi, the Governors of Bombay and Bengal kept their heads cool and saved the situation. But Sir Michael O'Dwyer had promised the Hon'ble Raizada Bhagat Ram on the 7th to show that his fist force was superior to Gandhi's soul force and it was necessary for him to do something dramatic to redeem his word. He asked for the introduction of Martial Law under an entirely false plea, "open rebellion in pursuance of a preconcerted organised conspiracy." The theory of this organised conspiracy has completely broken down. The Hunter Committee have unanimously found against it (page 75 and 76 of the report.) They say:—

"We find no evidence in the material before us of any antecedent conspiracy, as the mainspring of disorders."

The Minority have gone further and said that there was no rebellion at all. Yet it was on this basis that original sanction for the introduction of Martial Law was asked for and granted. It was on the same theory that the Lahore leaders were charged with being members of a conspiracy to

wage war against the Government, and when it was discovered that Ordinance No. 1 of 1919 with its limitations did not give sufficient power to effectively attack and break up the organisation behind the disturbances and to deal properly with the 'local, leaders,' a further application was made for extensive application of the Ordinance to *any person* charged with *any offence* committed *on or after the 30th March,* and for authorising the Martial Law Commissioners to pass any sentence authorised by law. Most of the political leaders in the Punjab, including Lala Harkishan Lal who had never made any speech nor written any article, nor taken any active part in the agitation against the Rowlatt Act, were charged with being members of this pre-conceived conspiracy that was alleged to have existed before the 30th March and it was on that assumption that they were convicted and punished. The Martial Law Commissioners and the Tribunals took judicial notice of the existence of a State of rebellion and presumed the existence of a conspiracy. They refused to go into evidence as to whether there was a state of war in the Punjab. There was no evidence produced at the trails or even before the Hunter Committee six months after the

trials, of the existence of this conspiracy, while numerous persons had in the meantime been sentenced to death and to transportation for life for the offence of being members of this conspiracy and waging war against His Majesty the King. On page 71, the majority have held that "on the evidence before us there is nothing to show that the outbreak in the Punjab was part of a pre-arranged conspiracy to overthrow the British Government in India by force." What does this signify except that Sir Michael O'Dwyer invented this theory, without any justification for a *bona fide* belief in its existence for the purpose of vindictive and malicious revenge on those who has defied his authority and his wishes? To gain this end most effectively he further proceeded to bar and prohibit all means of publicity by closing the province both to lawyers and to publicists of the highest reputations and of the most indisputable integrity. He deceived the Government of India by suggesting that he was asking for the declaration of Martial Law with the concurrence of the General Officer Commanding and the Chief Justice of the High Court. The General Officer Commanding has testified before the Hunter Committee that he did nothing of the kind and the Chief Justice of the

High Court is dead. Says the Minority Report of the Hunter Committee:—

It may be pointed out here that in the wireless of the 13th of April the Punjab Government in suggesting the declaration of Martial Law said that they were doing so "with concurrence of General Officer Commanding and Chief Justice, High Court." The General Officer Commanding, General Beynon, was asked about this and the following is his evidence on this point:—

Q.—That proclamation was signed by you on the 19th of April. You had been the highest military officer in this part of the world for some substantial time before that, and may I take it that you gave advice upon the question whether Martial Law was necessary before the question was referred to the Government of India at all?

A.—It was mentioned to me, but I do not think that you can really say my advice was given. *At all events I had nothing to do with the bringing in of Martial Law.* (Italics are mine).

Six months after the event Sir Michael O'Dwyer and his Chief Secretary and other Punjab officers

were asked to explain why the introduction of Martial Law was necessary and with what object was its introduction asked for. Mr. Kitchin, the Commissioner in charge of Lahore, stated as follows:—

Q.—If there were no other considerations, the civil authorities could soon after the 11th, that is, on the 12th, 13th or 14th, as the case may be, have taken back control and carried on with such aid as might have been necessary from the military?

A.—Yes, in individual places.

Q.—According to your statement in almost all places?

A.—Yes.

Q.—But your view is, that Martial Law was wanted, not for the purpose of getting control but for the purpose of what you describe as preventing the spread of infection?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And that is your only justification for Martial Law being declared?

A.—That was the immediate reason.

Q.—And also I take it the second important reason from your point of view to provide for the speedy disposal of the cases of persons who had already been arrested between the 10th and 13th ?

A.—That is a reason which weighed with me. I have no reason to suppose that it weighed with any one else.

Q.—In your view those were the two main reasons for the declaration of Martial Law, preventing the spread of infection and finding some speedy method of disposing of the cases of persons already arrested ?

A.—Yes.

In his written statement before the Hunter Committee, Sir Michael O'Dwyer has tried to invent all sorts of reasons which his imagination helped him to and classified them under 9 heads. The Minority Report has analysed them in a masterly way and has come to the conclusion that none of them was tenable, pointing out the untruthful nature of several statements of fact made by the late Lieutenant-Governor. Neither the majority of the Hunter Committee nor the Government of India have given any valid

reason to controvert the findings of the Minority. They have used the judgment of the Martial Law Tribunals in supporting their findings knowing full well that these tribunals had based their decisions on the statements in the *Ordinance*. The outstanding facts are :—

(*a*) That in the Punjab nothing violent happened except after the deportation of Drs. Kitchlew and Satyapal.

(*b*) That on the 10th also, the first shot was fired by the authorities resulting in several casualties the sight of which exasperated the mobs who in a frenzied state of mind committed several diabolical deeds which have unreservedly been condemned and deplored by all sections of the community.

(*c*) That as soon as the people got time to think, they were sorry for their deeds. On the 11th and 12th the civil authorities had no trouble in the city of Amritsar and proceeded to make arrests without any opposition or disturbance.

(*d*) That on the afternoon of the 13th when Sir Michael O'Dwyer applied for Martial Law, the situation was well in hand, and there was no ground for the supercession of ordinary civil authority.

(*e*) That the subsequent blaze in the Gujranwala District, the happenings at Lyallpur and Gujrat were the result of the Jallianwala Bagh incident, as found by the Hon'ble Mian Mohammed Shafi.

(*f*) That at no time was the situation so desperate as to call for the introduction of Martial Law.

(*g*) That the statement about attempts to tamper with the loyalty of the police and the soldiers have been disproved.

(*h*) That the menace of the Afghan invasion had not yet developed, and

(*i*) That Martial Law was only brought in for preventive or punitive purposes or for 'teaching a lesson.'

At this stage one might ask another question. If the situation was so serious why did not the Lieutenant-Governor make any attempts to find it out for himself? The distance from Lahore to Amritsar being only 35 miles by road can be traversed in less than an hour.

Continuance of Martial Law.

As regards the continuance of Martial Law even the Majority have said that "the wisdom of continuing Martial Law for the whole length of time remained effec-

tive in the Punjab is more open to objection than the original declaration." The Minority after dealing with the subject ably and exhaustively has condemned it outright. I will not therefore discuss the matter at length. But I think for facility of reference it will be necessary for me to make one or two large extracts from this part of the Minority Report.

It has been freely admitted by responsible officers of the Punjab Government, like Mr. Kitchin and Mr. Thompson, that Martial Law was introduced more for punitive and preventive purposes and for the punishment of offenders by summary procedure, than for the actual suppression of any rebellion. It was natural, therefore, that it should have been continued for a longer period than would otherwise have been the case.

Here again the personal responsibility of Sir M. O'Dwyer is unmistakable. Sir Michael O'Dwyer was under orders to go. His period of office had expired. The new Lieutenant-Governor had come, and was in the ordinary course of events to have taken over charge on the 26th April. But charge was not given to him because it was Sir Michael's wish to complete the work of ruining the Indian

Leaders and taking his revenge on the educated classes and of devastating the province before he divested himself of power. He therefore, did everything possible to extend the period of Martial Law. Unfortunately the Government of India proved too weak and succumbed to his wishes.

The glaring injustice of the tragedy cannot be easily comprehended unless one keeps in mind, all the time, the flagrant abuses of the Martial Law for vindictive and punitive purposes as was made clear by the barbarous orders promulgated during the Administration of Martial Law and the inhuman treatment meted out to, and the savage sentences inflicted on, all "offenders," big or small, high or low, but mostly educated and respectable.

We have the statement of the Punjab Government that 'on the 16th April (Martial Law was declared at Amritsar and Lahore on the 15th, at Gujranwala on the 16th, at Gujrat practically against the wishes of the district officer on the 19th, and at Lyallpur on the 24th) order began slowly to assert itself. *No large town was henceforth seriously affected* and the disorder was confined to isolated attacks on the communications and to outrages by the villagers. By the 19th matters may be said to have returned to

the normal in the greater part of the province. There is no further record of open disorder.'

The Indian Members of the Hunter Committee have carefully examined the various communications that passed between the Punjab Government and the Government of India on the subject and they say :—

"The reason for continuing Martial Law after the disorders had ceased, as stated by the Punjab Government thus :—

"The course of Martial Law administration subsequent to that (termination of disorder) was really in nature a substitute of civil administration of a summary type, of which the primary objects were to establish a *morale* which would afford a guarantee against the recrudescence of disorder, to safeguard railway and telegraph communications against further interruptions and to restore the position of Government as the guarantor of peace and good order which had been sacrified between the 10th and 17th April."

"In so far as the object to be achieved was the establishment of a proper *morale* and to restore the position of Government by which we suppose is meant and restore the prestige of Government, we do not think it affords a sufficient justification for subjecting

the whole population of large Districts of Martial Law administration.

"Sir Michael O'Dwyer's reasons for continuing Martial Law, after disorders had ceased, are the same nine reasons which he gave for the initial introduction of Martial Law and we have sufficiently dealt with them in a previous section. We may observe that some of these reasons, particularly 3 to 6, had lost much of their force by the experience of the period between the 10th and the 20th as none of the apprehensions underlying these reasons had materialised.

Government of India's Objections.

"The Government of India were, it appears, urging upon the Punjab Government that the continuance of Martial Law in any area must depend on the continuance of a state of rebellion in that area. When in their telegram of the 26th April, in urging the establishment of Summary Courts for the minor offences the Punjab Government said that unless that was done Martial Law might unnecessarily be protracted, because the powers of the Commissions depended on the existence of Martial Law and those Commissions would not be able to dispose of all the

cases speedily, the Government of India in their reply of the 20th April said as follows :—

"Government of India think termination of Martial Law in any area must depend entirely on continuance of a state of rebellion in that area; and the fact that cases are pending before Courts established under Regulation is not an adequate reason for suspension of ordinary law."

"It appears from Sir Michael O'Dwyer's evidence that the Government of India enquired on the 3rd May if Matrial Law could not then be withdrawn. The Punjab Government held on the 14th May, 1919, a Conference with the Military and Railway authorities and prepared a memorandum in reply.

"A careful perusal of that memorandum is instructive. In our opinion the question was discussed from an altogether a wrong point of view. The real question to discuss was as put by the Government of India, whether there was such a state of rebellion in the districts in question as to justify the continuance of Martial Law. Instead of that, the matter was considered from the point of view as to what the advantages were that were to be derived from the continuance of Martial Law. The memorandum after discussing the question from the military and

railway points of view (we have already dealt with these points) says:—

From the civil point of view it was considered that the following advantages are being derived from the continuance of Martial Law:—(1) It has undoubtedly a steadying effect on the population not only within the Martial Law areas but also outside. (2) In Lahore the fixing of prices is popular with masses. If Martial Law were discontinued this would have to be done by means of a Special Ordinance. (3) It is proposed to recover from the disturbed areas by means of a levy made under Martial Law a sufficient amount to cover certain incidental expenses which cannot be recovered by claims under section 15A of the Police Act. Among the items which have been suggested are:—

(*i*) The cost of military operations.

(*ii*) The cost of extra defences which the distrurbances have shown to be necessary, *e.g.*, at the Lahore Telegraph Office and the power station.

(*iii*) The cost of sending women and children out of the disturbed area and maintaining them in the Hills (orders sanctioning a levy for this purpose have already been issued in certain cases though as far as is known the levy has not yet been made).

The objection based on the desirability of recovering these sums of money from the disturbed areas is, however, not insuperable as it would be possible to authorise their recovery under a Special Ordinance.

(*iv*) It is considered desirable that in order to avoid demonstrations the trials of the principal offenders before the Martial Law Commissions should be completed before Martial Law is discontinued. It is expected that all the most important cases will be decided by the end of the month. * * * *

"In the above memorandum the Punjab Government put forward an additional reason for continuing Martial Law which further emphasises their notion about this matter to which we have already referred. In paragraph 5 they support the continuance of Martial Law on the ground that it will enable them to exclude from the Province persons from outside the Province who are likely to publish inflammatory or misleading accounts of the events in the Punjab without having resort to the Defence of India Act."

Government of India's Second Attempt.

Here is presented in concentrated form the whole mentality of Sir Michael O'Dwyer and the Punjab officials working under him. They wanted

to complete their work of destruction and in order to be able to do so without let or hindrance they wanted the prevention of publicity as well as the lawlessness of the Martial Law powers. But the Government of India was not yet convinced. They made two more efforts to assert their authority; but in the end capitulated. Says the Minority Report:—

"The Government of India by their telegrams of the 18th and 20th May intimated that Martial Law in Gujrat and Lyallpur ought to cease immediately. In the latter telegram they said they are also strongly of opinion that the cessation of martial law should be expedited. Your particular attention is invited to the terms of the Regulation for the condition precedent to the continuance of Martial Law." The Punjab Government in their memorandum of the 22nd May in referring to the above, say as follows:— "In the last sentence of your telegrams you draw attention to the terms of the Regulation as to the conditions precedent to the continuance of Martial Law. The suggestion is that it would be an exaggeration to describe the existing state of affairs as open rebellion. The Lieutenant-Governor recognises the weight of this criticism; but in so far as it is a technical objection to the continuance of Martial Law it can be cured by publishing a notification containing

a reference to the existence of a state of war with Afghanistan which has surpervened since the 15th April, when Martial Law was first declared." That a state of open rebellion no longer existed in the districts concerned was in the view of the Lieutenant-Governor only a technical objection. It was not realised that that was the fundamental condition on which the whole justification of Martial Law rested. The objection technical as it appeared to the Lieutenant-Governor, does not appear to have been cured in the manner suggested by him. It is difficult to hold that existence of the state of war with Afghanistan could support the continuance of Martial Law in the districts concerned if the stage of the alleged open rebellion had ceased long ago. The Punjab Government were apparently unwilling to discontinue Martial Law early even in Gujrat and Lyallpur. But the Government of India by their telegram of 30th May intimated that it should be abrogated from Gujrat at once and from Lyallpur "as soon as reports from that district indicate that this step can be taken." In fact the discontinuance or Martial Law at Lyallpur was delayed as late as the 9th June, presumably because the district officers were not in favour of such discontinuance. Certain correspondence between the Commissioner, Multan Division

and the Deputy Commissioner, Lyallpur, which was produced before us, shows that one of the objects for continuing Martial Law was to avoid trouble in getting in land revenue. The Commissioner in his letter dated the 20th May, 1919, says as follows:—
" His Honour spoke to me about Martial Law in your district. It is now the only rural area in which Martial Law exists. It has been kept on only because of the scare that there might be trouble in getting in revenue. I told His Honour that I understand that your fears on this subject had been somewhat diminished during the last few days; and that if an adequate military force is maintained in Lyallpur Martial Law is not required in any place at Lyallpur except the town, its vicinity and the Railways. If you have anything to say against this view, will you please write direct to the Chief Secretary and send a copy to me."

You will thus see what an opportunity this Martial Law was for the Punjab bureaucracy to impose their will on the people of the Punjab.

Martial Law Order.

But the worst has yet to come. When you sit down and examine the orders promulgated by the Martial Law administrators with the full cognisance and consent

of the Civil authorities and apparently under the inspiration of Sir Michael O'Dwyer you lose your breath.

Chapter V of the Minority Report opens with the following observations :—

A careful consideration of the various Martial Law orders in the different districts leaves the impression that over and above securing the maintenance of law and order they were designed and were used for punitive purposes, they interfered considerably with the ordinary life of people and caused much hardship and inconvenience. Such interference so far as really necessary, cannot be objected to but in our view as stated hereafter some of them were not necessary. Although these orders were issued by the Martial Law administrators in whom the power was legally vested, so far as the head quarters were concerned the civil authorities were in touch with the Martial Law administrators and in Lahore there were daily consultations between the Lieutenant-Governor the Chief Secretary and the Military authorities. Some of the Martial Law orders had the approval of the Civil authorities, and some were issued at their suggestions. Mr. Thompson says that, as a rule, on matters connected with the

ordinary life of the people, they were consulted before orders were promulgated. Regarding these Regulations, the Punjab Government in their case say : "They involved no inconsiderable interferance with the ordinary life of the people" and "that the total effect was punitive and to some extent restrictive." They further admit "The Curfew orders, the restrictions on travelling, the impressment of vehicles, the orders regarding roll-calls unquestionably involved much inconvenience to the people of Lahore."

About the administration of Martial Law in Lahore the Minority say that it was administered "intensively." The proper word in my judgment is "barbarously." All this was done under the very nose of the Lieutenant-Governor and with his knowledge and apparently with his consent.

Majority's Condemnation of Martial Law Orders.

Even the Majority have felt constrained to condemn some of these orders in language which is rather strong when compared with the tenor of the rest of their Report.

"As regards the Martial Law orders and cases arising out of the breach thereof we think it unfortunate that, in several important respects, Martial Law assumed as intensive a form as it did. It was not

being administered in an enemy country but in a country, where, on the restoration of normal conditions it was advisable that Martial Law administration should leave behind as little feeling of bitterness and unfairness as possible. Some of the orders issued were injudicious. They served no good purpose and were not, in our opinion, drawn with sufficient tact to prevent undue annoyance to the civil population."

The Majority have selected certain orders such as the Crawling Order of General Dyer, the Salaaming Order passed by General Campbell, orders passed against students by Col. Johnson, flogging orders passed by him, and some of the fancy punishments invented by Captain Doveton for specific mention and mild condemnation. The Minority have, as usual, gone more fully into the matter and pointed out a number of other orders which would seem to any one disposed to take even a moderate view of the duties and functions of Government, to be entirely barbarous and uncalled for. They first examine the orders passed by Col. Johnson and take exception to the order requiring every Ward in the city to keep at least four representatives from 8 a.m. till 5 p.m. at the Water Works station to learn what orders, if any, were issued and convey such orders to the inhabitants of their

Ward. Col. Johnson ruled that the onus of ascertaining the orders passed by him lay on the people through their representatives. This as they rightly point out, necessitated the attendance of a considerable number of persons of some position from morning till evening every day during the period of the Martial Law administration involving considerable inconvenience, humiliation and neglect of their ordinary business. Then they point out the orders by which the Martial Law administration discriminated between Europeans and Indians with the express object of teaching the Indian population a lesson.

"On the 15th April, he (Col. Johnson) issued what is known as the Curfew Order, prohibiting all persons other than Europeans or in possession of special military permits from leaving their houses or being in the streets between the hours 20, and 05. This was subsequently modified so as to make it applicable after 9 p.m., then 10 p.m., and ultimately on and after the 24th May, it was restricted to the hours of 12 p.m. and 2 a.m. He ordered the shops to be opened and business to be carried on, proceeded to fix in detail the prices of almost all commodities and issued orders for the prevention of adulteration of milk. He commandeered from Indians their motor cars and

other vehicles, electric lights and fans and notified that misuse or waste of pipe water would be deemed a contravention of Martial Law. With regard to this impressment of motor cars, etc., of Indians it appears that it was dictated by the desire to teach the population of Lahore a lesson. Though order No. III was in general terms asking for the delivery of all motors and vehicles of all description Lieutenant-Colonel Johnson had issued exemption certificates to Europeans, no such exemption being made in the case of Indian residents.

" He made it unlawful for two persons to walk abreast and prohibited all meetings and gathering of more than 10 persons. His treatment of students and the orders he passed about them and the manner in which the orders relating to the exhibition of Martial Law notices on buildings and other places we will deal in detail later on. By order VII, issued on the 16th April, Lieutenant-Colonel Johnson notified, " All orders to be issued under Martial Law will be handed to such owners property as I may select and it will be the duty of such owners of property to exhibit and to keep exhibiting all such orders. The duty of protecting such orders will, therefore, devolve on the owners of property and failure to ensure the

proper protection and continued exhibition of my orders will result in severe punishment."

He was proud of this order and called it one of the few brain waves he had. As an illustration of how he enforced obedience of his orders the Minority mention the case of the Sanatan Dharam College.

"It appears that a notice was stuck on the compound of the wall of the Sanatan Dharam College. It was subsequently torn by some body. Thereupon Col. Johnson ordered that every male person found in the precincts of the compound should be arrested. Sixty five students and all the Professors of that College were accordingly taken to the Fort which is three miles away and interned there for about 30 hours. They were then released after taking guarntees from the Principal that the defacing of notice would not happen again. Lieutenant-Colonel Johnson told us that he was waiting for an opportunity of doing so."

They then mention the order for the roll-call of a thousand students four times a day, who were made to walk 16 miles in the heat of the day for many days. When examined about this, Lieutenant. Colonel Johnson called the method adopted 'a physical exer-

cises for able-bodied young men.' It appears that in ordering the punishment of students he did not care whether the guilty were punished. What he wanted was that a certain percentage of them should be punished This he did in order to teach them that there was penalty even for suspected sedition.

Coming to orders passed by the Military Authorities in Amritsar the Minority observe that most of the Lahore orders were repeated, with some diabolical additions like the Crawling Order and the order of flogging in the street in which Miss Sherwood had been attacked. Coming to other Districts they select one order from the Gujranwala District issued on the 22nd April requiring the inhabitants of Gujranwala, whenever they met any gazetted European Civil or Military Officer to show respect to him by alighting from any wheeled conveyance or animal that such inhabitants might be riding and close any umbrellas that they might be carrying and to salute the said officers. A similar order was extended to Lyallpur District on the 30th April and to Gujrat District on the 2nd May. Restrictions on travelling by railway were imposed as a punishment for "decreased respect towards Europeans." The order about roll-call of students was made applicable

to the districts of Gujrat, Gujranwala and Lyallpur which the following notable addition in the Gujrat Area :—

"If any boy is absent without any proper cause, his father would attend in his place."

These orders were enforced even in the case of infants of 4 to 5 years. In one of these roll-calls at Wazirabad four small boys fainted from the heat and it was only then that the roll-call was abandoned. According to the evidence taken by the Congress Commissioners cases of this kind occured in other districts also.

On the 19th May, that is, fully one month after order had been generally established throughout the Province, the following order was issued :—

"Whereas two students of over 14 years of age failed to salaam to me on the 16th instant, thereby contravening 'Notice under Martial Law No. 7, and whereas it now transpires that they gave me their wrong names and addresses, I hereby direct that all students of over 14 years of age of the (1) Municipal Board School, Lyallpur, (2) Arya School, Lyallpur, (3) Sanatan Dharam School, Lyallpur, (4) Government High School, Lyallpur, shall parade in

front of my office in the Public Library at 08-00 (eight, hours daily until the two offenders are given up, or failing this until such time as I consider necessary. They will be accompanied by a Schoolmaster from each School, and will march past a Union Jack which will be erected in front of my office, and salaam to it as they pass, under the supervision of an officer appointed by me."

This order remained in force for one weak. Six boys were flogged at Kasur, because they happened to be the biggest; and this was for no offence proved against them, but simply because a schoolmaster represented that his boys had gone out of his hands and it was considered necessary to punish some. The officer who was responsible for this order maintained stubbornly before the Committee that his order was responsible.

Orders were issued for reprisals against the property of people who were represented to have left Gujranwala, Wazirabad and Hafizabad in order to avoid arrest. The property threatened included their own, their father's or their nearest relations.' The Minority have given a few instances as to how these orders were carried out.

"One Jamiat Singh Bugga who was a man of considerable position in Wazirabad and who was paying Rs. 2,000 as income-tax and had done considerable War work for which he had received official recognition, attended a meeting held on the 14th in connection with the *Hartal* which took place the next day, but does not appear to have taken any part in the demonstrations. It is not known whether he left Wazirabad for some legitimate business or because of the fear of being arrested. It is not known whether the orders for his arrest had already been issued at the time he left. Subsequently when the authorities went to his house and were informed by his son that he was not there, an order was passed by Lieutenant-Colonel O'Brien that the whole of his property be confiscated and after pronouncing this order, two men were deputed to turn out the immates of the house and take possession of the property, and several females and children were so turned out and the property was taken possession of. After a few days, Jamiat Singh surrendered himself on the 26th, and the property was released about the 4th May on the application of his son."

"In another case. three brothers had absconded. Not only was their property confiscated, but

their father was arrested and his property also confiscated. This was at the town of Sheikhupura in the district of Gujranwala.

"Another instance is that of Rala Ram who, it appears from Mr. Bosworth Smith's evidence, was arrested because his own Manga had absconded. It appears that with regard to people who had left their places of residence and were wanted, orders were issued prohibiting any people connected with them from cutting the crops in their fields until they returned.

"In Kasur, a general order was issued on the 20th April to the following effect:—

'And further also all such residents who have left Kasur on or after the 10th April 1919, will return to Kasur within four-days from this date. failing, measures will be taken against their property.' Captain Doveton told us that in connection with this order, six houses were visited and opened and in some cases clothes and vessels found inside were burnt and destroyed."

Mobile columns took hostages for good behaviour of villages and Lambardars were flogged and fined,

for disinclination to help and to give information. It appears that in one case mentioned in the Minority Report the officer who gave this order of flogging and fine found out after the order had been carried out, that the Lambardar concerned was innocent.

At Wazirabad Rs. 3,500 were collected from the inhabitants after the declaration of Martial Law for supplying the want of soldiers stationed there. Such were some of the orders issued by the Martial Law Administrators with the knowledge and apparent consent of Sir Michael O'Dwyer and it was for the enforcement of these orders that Martial Law was continued in spite of the protests of the Government of India to the contrary. The Government of India have disposed of all this with the following observation :—

"We are not prepared to say that all these orders were without justifications but we consider that the Administration of Martial Law in Lahore was in some respects unduly severe and exceeded its legitimate limits, that is to say, the requirement of the military situation and the maintenance of law and order. The Minority condemn the order imposing on property-owner's responsibility for

the safety of Martial Law notices pasted on their houses. The Government of India are not prepared to say that in the circumstances this order was improper. The Minority express their strong disapproval of the confinement of the Professors and Students of the Sanatan Dharam College because certain Martial Law notices had been destroyed. The Government of India agree that this order exceeded the necessity of the case. The Minority further criticise and condemn the conduct of certain officers, notably Col. O'Brien, Mr. Bosworth Smith and Mr. Jacob, for various orders passed by them in the Administration of Martial Law. The Government of India agree that in the instances cited the officers mentioned acted injudiciously and in some cases improperly. While the findings of the Minority report in regard to all these points are very cogent and in some cases fully justified, it must be remembered that officers charged with the Administration of Martial Law cannot be expected to act in abnormal conditions with that care and circumspection which are possible in normal times, nor can such a standard be rigorously applied for the subsequent examination of their actions in the calm atmosphere of safety after order has been restored."

This last remark of the Government of India loses its force when we remember that all the three officers mentioned were permanent members of the Punjab Commission and had been employed in civil administration for years.

Sir Michael O'Dwyer's conduct during the disorders and afterwards, was fully in consonance with the spirit which had characterized his Administration of the Punjab from 1913 to 1919. Considering the daily consultations and frequent conferences that were being held at the Government House, during the five days immediately preceding the declaration of Martial Law, and considering the frequent communications by telephone, telegraph and special messengers, that were passing between the Lieutenant-Governor and the Chief Secretary on the one hand and the other Civil and Military Officers of the Government in Lahore and outside on the other, and considering Sir Michael O'Dwyer's approval of the action of General Dyer at the Jallianwala Bagh, the Lieutenant-Governor and his Chief Secretary, are really speaking, primarily responsible for all the outrages that were committed on the people of the Punjab by the servants of the Punjab Government and the Martial Law Administrators. I contend that

either directly or by indirect action, they inspired all the orders that were passed by Martial Law Administrators and Martial Law Tribunals in April and May 1919. There is only one order to which the Lieutenant-Governor appears to have taken exception, *viz.*, the Crawling Order of General Dyer. Sir Michael O'Dwyer had the power and the opportunity to control the Martial Law Administrators and keep them within bounds, if he had desired to do so. Instead of controlling them he encouraged them to do lawless acts. I maintain that his conduct was criminal and that he was principally responsible for all that was subsequently done in the Punjab in the name of law and order. I maintain that all through these outrages his was the inspiring mind and his the guiding hand. General Dyer's action was the crowning act of a drama for which the stage had been set and actors trained, inspired and prompted by Sir Michael O'Dwyer. There were daily consultations between the Lieutenant-Governor, the Chief Secretary and the Military authorities.

Martial Law Administration.

So far I have spoken of the orders promulgated by the Martial Law Administrators. Bad and shocking as they are they fall into shade when you come to consider

the outrages that were actually committed, in the name of law and order, on the persons and property of the Punjabees in the carrying out of these orders, in the course of arrests, investigations and trials. I can give only a few samples by way of illustration.

Amritsar.—You have already heard of the Jallianwala Bagh massaore, of the Crawling Order and the flogging in public and other places of boys and others. But there are some other things connected with the Administration of Martial Law in Amristar and other places which have not unfortunately attracted as much notice as they deserve. Lala Girdhari Lal, Secretary of the General Flour Mills Company, Amritsar, who acted as the General Secretary of the Amritsar Congress, has given a list of a few of these outrages in his statement made before the Congress Commissioners.

Says he :—

" All the lawyers of the town were made special constables, insulted and abused, and made to witness public flogging and to carry furniture like ordinary coolies. All persons in the city were made to salaam every Englishman. Disobedience to this resulted in arrest and detention in the look-up. Some were

ordered to stand in the Sun for hours in the hot season, and others made to learn salaaming by practising it for some time, etc. Handcuffing of respectable persons was the order of the day. The inhuman and barbarous order of crawling was kept up for days. Even a *blind man had to do so, and was kicked for failure.* The ways of police torture were numerous and brutal. Lashing, after tying up the hands high, was common. Men's hands were *frequently put under cots legs over which many persons sat.* Permission was not easily granted to persons in custody to attend to calls of nature. Abusing, slapping, pulling off people's moustaches and beards were considered light punishments. *Even burning coal was put on the palms of a person,* making him confess to what the police wanted him to say. Nails were driven in the hands of another, and one man was forced to drink urine, and sticks were thrust into the anus of others."

(Page 14 of the evidence collected by the Congress Commissioner.)

Every one of these charges has been substantiated by the direct evidence of persons who suffered, and of those who witnessed their suffering.

Raliyaram and Abdulla have said that they were forced not only to crawl on their bellies but while crawling were kicked by the soldiers with their boots and struck with the butt ends of their rifles. L. Kahan Chand, a blind man, told how even he was made to crawl and was kicked. Six boys were flogged in public, one of them, Sunder Singh. "became senseless after the fourth stripe, but after some water was poured into his mouth by soldiers, he regained consciousness. Flogging was then resumed. He lost his consciousness for the second time, but the flogging never ceased till he was given 20 stripes. He was taken off the flogging post bleeding aud quite unconscious. The other boys were similarly treated and the majority of them became unconscious, while they were being flogged. They were all handcuffed and as they could not walk even a few places, they were dragged by the police. They were then taken to the Fort."

A very revolting statement has been made by a woman, Balochan by name. The statement is No. 147 in the volume of evidence collected by the Congress Commissioners. The Secretary of State has now (after 5 months) ordered an enquiry into the same. I will therefore refrain from quoting it here.

It appears that 789 persons were arrested and were brought to trial. The period of detention ranged from 1 day to 79 days. Their treatment during detention was inhuman. Old and sick persons were handcuffed, chained and made to walk long distances in the burning sun of April and May. In one case so many as 52 were chained in one line with handcuffs on. Sometimes handcuffs were not taken off even in the lock-up.

In statements made by Amritsar witnesses very serious charges have been made against 4 police officers of high rank, 2 European and 2 Indian, Messrs. Marshall and Plomer, Sukha Singh and Jawahar Lal. The allegations are specific and unequivocal. They are made by men of position. They have been before the Punjab Government for the last five or six months. They are either true or untrue. Yet nothing has been done. If the former, the men should have been prosecuted and punished. If untrue, those who made the statements could be dealt with under the law. One of them is at present holding a position higher than the one he held during the Martial Law days, and the others are still in Government service, though I am not in a position to say whether in the same rank or in a higher rank.

Coming to Lahore, we have several notable instances of *inhumanity* practised during the administration of Martial Law. I will only mention one case that has already attracted some attention, namely, that of Mr. Manohar Lal, Bar-at-Law, who was for some time Minto Professor at the University of Calcutta. His invalid wife and children were dragged from their rooms, forced to take shelter in the servants' quarters and the kitchen. He was kept under arrest for 28 days and then let off without a charge and without a trial. He has not till now been informed of what his offence was. He was apparently arrested and harassed and insulted and humiliated because he was one of the Trustees of the *Tribune*. As to what was done to Lala Harkishan Lal and other leaders it is already known to you.

At Kasur, Baba Dhanpat Rai, a Pleader, aged 65, was under arrest of 46 days and was eventually released without having been told what he had been arrested for.

On the first of May, the whole town of Kasur, excepting women and small children, was required to attend at the Railway Station for the purpose of identification and made to sit in the sun till 2 P M., without water or food.

A boy of 11 years was charged with *waging* war against the King.

Fancy punishments were invented and administered.

At Gujranwala, leaders were handcuffed in pairs and about 22 of them chained together, made to walk through the city under conditions of mockery and carried to Lahore in an open truck without food. They were not even allowed to dress.

Lala Beli Ram Kapur of Hafizabad was arrested and locked up with 23 others in a room measuring 12 by 25, the same room having to be used by all of them for natural purposes also. They were kept as under-trial prisoners up to the 6th of June.

At Sangala Hill school boys including little children were compelled to attend roll call from day-to-day and made to stand in the hot sun and say "Sir, we have done nothing wrong and we will do nothing wrong in future." This was so strict that Mr. Balmukand could not get an exemption for his nephew 7 years old......On the 5th day on his return he was perspiring. "He fell down and began vomiting. Doctor Gian Chand of Sangala

was called but in vain. Then an Army I.M.S. who was there, was called, but he too could not help. The boy died on the 7th May." The roll call was compulsory for 4 times every day.

The authorities wanted the nephew of Nihal Chand and he was not at the time in Sangala, the uncle was arrested. He was kept standing in the sun like many other people. "Owing to my old age," he proceeds, "and also owing to the strong sunshine I fell down senseless 3 times. I was released after 4 or 5 days without any explanation."

Dr. Karam Singh Nanda relates how he in common with others had to be in daily attendance for identification and stand in the sun without water or food. He says that many fainted and that he suffered so much from the heat of the sun from day-to-day that he fell ill and was invalided for two months. He says that he was identified as being in Sangala on the 12th whereas he was in Gujranwala and had to give evidence in the Court on that day. He also refers to the fact that 140 men who were arrested were detained for 9 days and were asked to pay Rs. 50,000 if they wished to be released.

About Manianwala, Teja Singh says:

"I had not yet left for the bungalow where most of the villagers and gone by the order of the police. It was in my presence that Mr. Bosworth Smith gave a severe beating to Munshi Nawab Din and Lehna Singh. He asked him to give evidence against Bhai Mool Singh forcing him to say that the latter had delivered a speech against the Government. After placing him in the custody of a constable who was ordered to take him to the bungalow, Mr. Bosworth Smith went towards the women. He removed their veils and used abusive language. He called them "flies, bitches, she-assess" and worse things. He said to them "Your skirts will be examined by the police constables. When you were sleeping with your husbands why did you allow them to get up and go." He also spat on them.

Gurdevi, the aged widow of Mangal Jat stated before Mr. Labh Singh; "One day, during the Martial Law period Mr. Bosworth Smith gathered together all the male persons of our village, over eight years, at the bungalow which is some miles from our village, in connection with the investigations that were going on. While the men were at the bungalow he rode to our village, taking back

with him all the women who met him on the way, carrying food for their men at the bungalow. Reaching the village he went round the lanes and ordered all the women to come out of their houses, himself forcing them out with sticks. He made us all stand near the village *Daira.* The women folded their arms before him, he beat some with sticks, spat at them and used the foulest and most unmentionable language. He hit me twice and spat in my face. He forcibly bared the faces of all the women, and brushed aside their veils with his own stick. He called them she-assess, bitches, flies" and "swine" and said "you were in the same bed with your husbands why did you not prevent them from going out to do mischief? Now your skirts will be looked into by the police constables." "He gave me a kick also and ordered us to undergo the torture of holding our ears by passing our arms under and round the legs, while being bent double." This statement is supported by several women of Manianwala.

One Lehna Singh says:—"As we left for the bungalow the Sahib addressed the women whose cries fell upon our ears, as we went along."

The statements relating to Manianwala were tested by Mr. C. F. Andrews who personally visited

the village and brought independent evidence of these events.

Nawa Pind:—The vagaries of Mr. Bosworth Smith here can be judged by one sample. On the 9th of May two brothers were arrested and were convicted and sentenced to two years' rigorous imprisonment One of these pleaded *alibi* but to no effect. After his conviction his *alibi* was proved by the written statement of Mr. Wathen, the Principal of the Khalsa College, and the men had to be eventually released under what authority we do not know. Some witnesses who had given evidence of *alibi* were also sentenced to various terms of imprisonment and had to be likewise released. One Bhugwan Singh was *flogged* because he had the audacity to plead that he was innocent. In the course of flogging he became unconscious but Mr. Bosworth Smith did not care. The Village was fined Rs. 10,000. One-third of this fine was realised during the Last Rabi.

Maya Singh says that his son Ujagar Singh had gone out to fetch medicine and was arrested together with others. He protested and "thereupon Langra Sahib (Mr. Bosworth Smith) ordered him to be fastened to a tree and to be given 25 stripes." . . . . . .

A 60 years old respected Lambardar of 38 years' standing and a retired Inspector of Police was arrested simply because his sons were not at Shaikhupura when they were wanted. His property was confiscated and his tenants prohibited from cutting the crops.

Sardar Boota Singh, B A., LL.B., was a member of the District War League who had assisted in recruiting and had received a certificate for his services. Together with the other Pleaders he was suddenly arrested on the morning of the 19th. "All of us were put in charge of some 25 soldiers who carried loaded guns with fixed bayonets. From the Railway Station we were taken to Central Jail, Lahore, where we were handcuffed and taken to solitary cells. For 40 days we were thus detained thereby suffering the greatest possible discomfort and hardship."

At Lyallpore, Lala Chint Ram Thapar says:— "At about 11 a.m. in the scorching heat we had to walk from the Jail to the station with handcuffs and fetters on. Our ankles were wounded owing to the fetters."

The Deputy Commissioner of Gujrat was surprised when he received the order extending Martial Law to his district. He would not believe and

wired to Lahore that there must be some mistake. Yet Martial Law was declared there and many respectable Pleaders including Barristers were arrested and kept in custody for a long time to be eventually acquitted. The Court found that the witness set who had given evidence for the prosecution had *perjured*. Yet permission to prosecute the latter was not granted. A boy of ten years of age was among those who were arrested and sent to Lahore on a charge of waging war against the King. An indemnity of Rs. 42,000 has been fixed for Gujrat and is to be collected in six instalments, one instalment having been already realised.

Jallalpur Jattan. This village suffered similar indignities and had besides an indemnity of Rs. 12,000 imposed upon it. One-sixth of this had been realised.

Sri Ram Sud. About the firings under orders of Lala Sri Ram Sud, the Minority have come to the conclusion, which is the only conclusion possible on his own testimony, that they were unjustified and that his action was intended to be punitive and for the purpose of creating an impression. I maintain that Sri Ram's action was not *bona fide* as it was done without due care and caution

and that he is liable to be prosecuted and punished under the Indian Penal Code, for having caused loss of human life and having endangered the safety of so many people. The same can be said with more or less force of the firings indulged in by Sergeant Davis and Captain Flowerdew.

Bombs. The orders to use aeroplanes and to bomb the people from the air also emanated from Sri Michael O'Dwyer. Major Carbery dropped bombs on the Khalsa High School, on the people of two villages. The Minority have condemned it and also the dropping of bombs on the 16th April. There cannot be any doubt that the dropping of bombs from the aeroplanes for the purpose of suppressing internal disorder was an act of unwarranted barbarity unworthy of civilised Government. Six lawyers of Gurdaspur were arrested and detained for a long time and then released without trial. This incident has been condemned even by the Government of India.

Trial. When we come to the administration of justice during Martial Law days, we see the same Prussian mind working throughout, first in the selection of Judges, secondly in the framing of

charges under the orders of the Local Government and finally, in the sentences inflicted.

It was absolutely wrong, if not illegal, to extend Martial Law Ordinance to offences committed before the introduction of Martial Law, and to any *offence* committed after the 30th March. This was clearly beyond the intention of the framers of the Regulation. Even the Hunter Committee have condemned the trial of Drs. Kitchlew and Satyapal under the Martial Law Ordinance.

As regards Summary Court powers, and in giving them practically a *carte blanche* as to procedure and punishments, we again find the Government of India first protesting against the principle laid down by Sir Michael O'Dwyer and eventuallly succumbing to his importunities. (P. R. 88 and 89).

In all 2537 persons were tired before different Courts under the Martial Law regulation, of whom 1804 were convicted, *i.e.*, about 72 per cent. If we compare the result with the percentage of convictions in ordinary Courts and the percentage of convictions in cases arising out of the South-Western riots of 1915 (*viz.*, 700 out of 4,000), we will see the difference

between ordinary trails and trails before the Martial Law Tribunals of 1919. The main purpose of Martial Law as stated by official witnesses before the Hunter Committee was the speedy trial of these offenders.

Under section 2 (2) Martial Law Ordinance of 1919, four Commissions were appointed consisting of 3 members in each, that altogether twelve Judges. It is significant that not a single Hindu or a Sikh was appointed on these Commissions. A mere glance at the judgment of these Commissions, collected together by Mr. Pearay Mohan in his book. " An imaginary rebellion and how it was suppressed," should show what kind of justice was administered by these judges. There are only a few of these documents, perhaps not more than half a dozen out of a total of 68, printed in this book which can lay claim to be called judgments at all. The most elaborate of them are those delivered in the cases of the Lahore, Amritsar and Gujranwala leaders. They are the best samples of the mentality of the Judges who wrote them. In the Lahore case, for example, the charge included the following allegations :

The measure commonly known as the Rowlatt Bill was passed by the Imperial Council on 18th

March 1919. Thereupon a general conspiracy was formed by persons outside the Punjab with whom the accused associated to hold tumultous meetings and to ordain a general strike with the intention and subject of inflaming popular feeling against Government and to so overawe it as to try and induce the vetoing of the measure.

Accordingly, throughout India and the Punjab in particular, the said conspirators, including the accused, declared a general strike, commonly known as *hartal*, to take place on the 30th March intending thereby to induce disorder, paralyze the economic life of the country and excite disaffection and hatred towards Government.

Such a conspiracy existed before the 30th March, but in as much as the Commissions are not empowered to try offences committed *prior* to 30th March, acts committed by them in the course of such a conspiracy are not charged against them. They are charged only with the acts they each committed during the period between the 30th March and 13th April, and act *prior* to or subsequent to that period are being proved merely to establish a continuity of their conduct.

The primary object of this conspiracy was to secure the repeal of the Rowlatt Act by illegal means, which is an offence under section 120-A (2); the accused before the commission are however, alleged to have proceeded further than this, and to have conspired either among themselves or with others within the conspiracy to:—

(*a*) procure the repeal of the Rowlatt Act by criminal means.

(*b*) Commit a series of criminal acts such as sedition, etc.

(*c*) to wage war against the King.

These said conspiracies are punishable under sections 120B and 121A, Indian Penal Code.

In addition thereto the accused are alleged to have committed or abetted certain criminal acts, and to have taken certain action in pursuit of the objects of such conspiracies.

Being members of a conspiracy, each accused is responsible for the acts of every other conspirator, whether before the Commission or not, committed in pursuit of the commonoare object of the conspiracy, whether they are committed *prior* to or subsequent

to the date on which such accused joined the conspiracy or did any act in pursuance of the common objects of the conspiracy.

It must be distinctly understood, however, that the charge against each accused is not limited to the particular acts committed by himself, but extends to all acts committed by other conspirators in the pursuit of the common object; and that even if it be found that the particular acts of an accused are not in themselves criminal, he is responsible for the criminal acts of others in the conspiracy and committed in pursuit of the object of each conspiracy.

There is not a scrap of evidence of any such conspiracy and the Hunter Committee has distinctly found against it; yet in all these cases its existence was presumed and many convictions were based thereupon. The same can be said of the Amritsar case:

"Briefly stated the case for the prosecution is that a criminal conspiracy was formed in Amritsar, in conjunction with conspirators elsewhere, to overawe Government and secure the abandonment of the Rowlatt Acts; that this criminal conspiracy was in existence on the 30th of March 1919 and

that these 15 persons were then members of, or subsequently (up to the 13th April 1919) joined it."

In the Gujranwala leaders' case, too, there was the same allegation and the same presumption.

"The case for the prosecution is that the present accused were members of a conspiracy entered into with the object of overawing Government in connection with the Rowlatt Act and had agreed to carry out their object by the commission of the acts described above."

It was by this presumption of a conspiracy that a large number of highly respectable people, the flower of the Punjab educated Community, were arrested and sentenced to death, transportation for life or long terms of imprisonment.

The idea was to get rid of every political leader, actual or potential, and have the Punjab entirely at the mercy of the bureaucracy.

Here are a few more samples:—

In a Kasur case, against 15 persons charged with the murder of two Europeans, and for offences against others, Colonel Irving's Commission says:— "We have taken judicial notice and have not

required evidence on the existence of a state of insurrection at Kasur on April 12th." In this case 11 persons were sentenced to death and three to transportation for life. Two of the persons sentenced to death were recommended for mercy.

In one of the Lahore cases, a person who had shouted to a Police Officer. "Tum Hamara Bhai Hamarai Sath Shahid ho" (*i.e.*, you are our brother, come and be martyr with us) was sentenced to transportation for life simply upon the proof of this shouting.

In a Gujranwala case, tried by Colonel Irving's Commission, the case arising out of the burning of a *Patwarkhana* without any loss of life, three persons were sentenced to death and others to transportation for life with forfeiture of property.

In the Hafizabad case, in which the charge related to an assault on Lieutenant Tatam, (who was not killed nor even injured) four persons including a student of 18 years of age were sentenced to death and 15 others to transportation for life with a recommendation for mercy in favour of two of the latter.

In the Nizamabad case, in which there was no allegation of murder, four persons were sentenced to

death with forfeiture of property, eight to transportation for life with forfeiture of property and four others to various terms of imprisonment ranging from five to ten years, and four to 20 stripes.

In the case dealing with the assault on Mrs. Sherwood, seven persons were sentenced to death with forfeiture of property and eight to transportation for life.

In the National Bank Murder case, all 20 of the accused were sentenced to death and forfeiture of property. In the Kasur supplementry case, 14 were sentenced to death and about nine to transportation for life with recommendation for mercy in favour of some, in each case forfeiture of property also forming part of the penalty.

In the case dealing with an attempt to assault Mrs. Easden, six men were sentenced to death and forfeiture of property, and seven to transportation for life accompanied by the same additional penalty.

In the Gujranwala leaders' case, in which the conviction was based principally upon the presumption of a conspiracy, two persons including one of the leading lawyers, were sentenced to death and the

others to transportation for life and various terms of imprisonment.

In the Supplementary Case relating to the National Bank murder, another person was sentenced to death raising the total to 21.

In the Kasur supplementary case, two more persons were sentenced to death and one to transportation for life with forfeiture of property in each case.

This is by no means a complete list, but this will do to give you an idea of the justice that was administered by the Martial Law Commissioners. About these sentences the Minority have made the following remarks in their Report. (Severity is rather a very mild term for these sentences.)

" It may be noticed that the sentences passed by the Martial Law Commissions were considerably reduced by Government. Out of 108 death sentences, only 23 were maintained and the remaining were commuted to transportation in some cases and in the rest to sentences of imprisonment going down to one year. Out of 265 sentences of transportation, only two were maintained, five were commuted to imprisonment varying from ten years to one year.

There is a great disproportion between the original sentences and those to which they were commuted and this gives ground for the suggestion of initial severity that has been made."

Since this was written some more death sentences have been commuted (three of Amritsar are known to me) and possibly some remissions have been made in other cases also. For all this our best thanks are due to Sir Edward Maclagan. But these commutations and remissions are by no means satisfactory. Most of those to whom the benefit of the Royal Amnesty has been extended were absolutely innocent. They were convicted in panic, upon insufficient evidence and upon presumptions of a conspiracy which never existed. Just look at the following which is taken from a Lahore judgment:—

It is beyond doubt that the Lahore mob which marched on the Civil Station of Lahore was actuated by the same motives as that of Amritsar. It was essentially part of the same insurrection and it was fully aware of what had happened in the neighbouring town, the same day. It was rapidly becoming more threatening, and had already displayed its contempt of the authority and person of the District Magistrate. A collision was inevitable and had the

mob proceeded a little further up the Mall it would have found supply of deadly weapons ready to hand. Had it not been checked where it was, there was the gravest danger that it would have hurried on, in the confusion and darkness, to the commission of awful crimes.

In ordinary circumstances the offences actually would not have amounted to more than rioting, but this occurrence cannot be viewed as a detached and independent incident. It was plainly a part and parcel of the rebellion which had already broken out.

The Jallianwala Massacre. New lies.

The Jallianwala Massacre has attracted so much attention and has been so extensively dealt with both in the press and on the platform that it was not originally my intention to refer to it all to-day in my speech; but since then, I have read General Dyer's written statement which he presented to the Army Council in England, and have also read the speeches made in the course of the debate in the Houses of Parliament. Some of the statements made by General Dyer himself and by his defenders are entirely inconsistent with the evidence which General Dyer gave before the Hunter Committee

while others are obviously after-thoughts. I select the following samples from his written defence in the army Council :—

(*a*) A great crowd from the city, of 30,000, had menaced the Civil Settlement on the 10th. Its audacity in the meantime had grown with its crimes and their immunity. The villages had been brought in and I had to reckon upon the possibility of the eruption that night of some 30,000 Majha Sikh looters if that whole movement were not decisevely checked.

(*b*) I found a large meeting, afterwards ascertained to be from 15,000 to 20,000 in number, addressed by a speaker engaged in violent exhortation.

(*c*) There were no women and children in the meeting.

(*d*) I was liable to be assailed from behind and the extrication of my small force from the city would have been practically impossible if after the firing the rebels had maintained an aggressive spirit.

(*e*) After some firing, two groups appeared to be collecting as though to rush us and on my Brigade Major calling my attention to this, I direct-

ed fire specially to the two points in question and dispersed the groups.

Now a perusal of General Dyer's statement before the Hunter Committee would show that none of these allegations were made before that body. The last statement is absolutely new and being inconsistent with what General Dyer had stated before the Hunter Committee, can fairly be said to be false.

The following questions and answers support this view :—

Q.—No question of having your forces attacked entered into your consideration at all ?

A.—No. The situation was very, very serious. I had made up my mind that I would do all men to death if they were going to continue the meeting.

* * * * * * * *

Q.—You commenced firing the moment you had got your men in position ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The crowd had begun to go away when you continued firing ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The crowd were making an effort to go away by some of the entrances at the further end of the Bagh ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You put your pickets one to the right and one to the left of the entrance? Towards some places the crowd was getting thicker than other places ?

A.—They did.

Q.—From time to time you changed your firing and directed it to places where the crowds were thickest ?

A.—That is so.

Q.—Is that so ?

A.—Yes.

Nor is there any *hint* or suggestion of this fact any where in any other document issued by Government relating to the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. It is not mentioned in the Punjab Government's report nor in the testimony of the Superintendent of Police who was with General Dyer at the time of the firing. It is absolutely a new invention.

As to the statement in clause (*c*) it is opposed to facts. It is stated in the Punjab Government's report of these disturbances that at least five children, one under ten, and four under 15 were among the killed. (See page 8). The photograph of one of these boys aged 13 has been published in the Congress Committee Report, facing page 56. There is reliable evidence that other children were also in the crowd. If General Dyer had said that he was unaware of the presence of the children in the crowd his position would have been defensible, but he makes a positive statement, which is, on the face of it, untrue. The statements made in clause (*a*) are absolutely unwarranted by the facts as found by the Hunter Committee and as testified to by the Deputy Commissioner of Amritsar and other officers examined by the Hunter Committee.

As to General Dyer's statement that there was a gathering of 15,000 to 20,000 in number being addressed by a speaker engaged in violent exortation, that is clearly a later invention. At that time his estimate of the number of people who were present at the meeting was 5,000 and as to the exhortation he could not have heard it, and could have had no reason to suppose that the speaker was engaged in violent extortation.

All that he stated before the Hunter Committee was that he saw a man in the centre. "His arms were moving about; he was evidently addressing a meeting." Asked if "there was any crying beyond that he was addressing the meeting." He replied "No; I cannot say that there was anything beyond that he was addressing the meeting."

An exhibit was placed before the Martial Law Commissioners who tried the Amritsar leaders which contained a copy of the resolution that had been passed at that meeting before General Dyer reached there and began to fire. A perusal of that document shows that the meeting had actually passed a resolution of loyalty, condemning the action of mobs on the tenth and expressing horor at the death of so many Europeans. Surely such a meeting could not except by a gross misuse of words be said to be a rebellious meeting and General Dyer has no justification for describing it as an army of rebels. Now facts are being invented every day in connection with this affair. It is now said that the gathering was armed with 'bludgeons,' which is again a lie. No such statement was made before the Hunter Committee. The Committee found that the people assembled were 'unarmed'; General Dyer himself said that some of them might have sticks.

Sir Michael O'Dwyer's approval.

The most important fact, however, in regard to the Jallianwala Bagh massacre is its approval by Sir Michael O'Dwyer which practically laid the law for the other officers for the rest of the period of the Martial Law. Sir Michael O'Dwyer had the details of this massacre before him when he approved of the action of General Dyer on the 14th of April. The following extract from the report of the *viva voce* examination of Sir Michael O'Dwyer called from the Hunter Committee's report shows the attitude of his mind.

Q.—I want to ask you a few question about the Jallianwala Bagh incident. You say on page 10, "the casualties were large and regrettable, but loss of life was inevitable when a truculent mob which had already committed murder and rebellion assembled to defy authority?

A.—You have got my *addendum* to that statement.

Q.—Yes. I will deal with that. The view there seems to be as if the crowd that had assembled there had committed

murder and rebellion. Is there any evidence that that particular crowd had committed any murder or rebellion ?

A.—I do not suppose it could be said with reference to any particular crowd, but Amritsar city, as a whole, had committed murder and rebellion.

Now looked at in this light, Sir Michael O'Dwyer becomes directly responsible for all the atrocities and outrages that were committed in the Punjab by various Officers, Military and Civil, after the 14th of April. His approval of General Dyer's action sealed the situation for them, and being sure of the approval and sanction of the Head of the Government, they did not think it necessary to make a proper exercise of their powers and to take into consideration the feelings of the people. One of them, Colonel O'Brien, made sure of the support of the Government by telephoning to the Chief Secretary and got a *carte blanche* from him in explicit terms. It is some satisfaction to find that General Dyer's action has been condemned by the Government of India, by the Secretary of State, by the Army Council and by the leading statesmen of the British Nation. But much of that satisfaction is discounted by the fact that the

Government of India and the Secretary of State have both failed to appreciate the magnitude of the offence of Sir Michael O'Dwyer. In the view which I take of the affair, I consider the latter to be the greater criminal of the two. General Dyer was a Military man, brought up in military traditions and perhaps took an exaggerated view of his duties as a Military Commander; but Sir Michael O'Dwyer was a Civilian. There was no justification for his attitude in the matter except on the plea that he was even more militarist that Dyer. To let him off with the simple remark that he "would have acted more wisely if, before expressing approval, he had taken steps to ascertain the facts and circumstances of the firing more fully", is an actual denial of justice to the afflicted people against the very man who was chiefly responsible for all their woes.

Sir Michael O'Dwyer's statements in England.

But Sir Michael O'Dwyer is not only absolutely unrepentant, but is pursuing us with the same relentless energy and malice as he displayed during his tenure of Office in India, and during the Martial Law days. In a letter which he addressed to the "London Times" from Delhi, and which was published in that paper on February 9th, he took

exception to certain statements made by that paper about his having approved General Dyer's action in shooting without warning and in issuing the Crawling order. In that letter, he makes a great fuss over the fact that he did not himself send any telegram to General Dyer approving of his action, entering into an elaborate defence, as if to show that he had no option but to approve of that action, because General Dyer's superior officer had done so. He says "it was not for me to say that he had gone too far, when I was told by his superior officer that he fully approved General Dyer's action." The fact remains that he did authorize General Beynon to communicate to General Dyer his approval of the latter's action and he has all through defended it whole-heartedly and unreservedly. Then, note another baseless statement of his. He says "If I am now asked to reconstruct the situation at Amritsar on April 13th and 14th, I would put it in this way, "many *urban places* in the Ceneral Punjab were then in a state of open rebellion, mobs were in possession of the great cities of Lahore and Amritsar." Now it is absolutely untrue that "many urban areas in the Central Punjab" were then in a state of open rebellion. In the chronological list of events, at the end of the Hunter Committee Report, you do not

find a mention of a single urban place in the Central Punjab where anything rebellious happened on the 13th. At Amritsar nothing happened after the 10th which could in any way justify that statement. It is equally untrue that "on the 13th and 14th rebellious mobs were in possession of the great cities of Lahore and Amritsar."

Again, he and his champions in England have recently been trying to support his action in introducting Martial Law by quoting certain statements made in the farewell addresses, which he practically extorted from the people of the Punjab on the eve of his departure from Lahore. In a letter to the "London Times" he says "Had the inquiry started directly after the disorders were suppressed the true facts could have been fully and easily ascertained. Lord Sydenham's letter in the "Times" of June 9th, 1920, tells us how in the middle of May 1919 when the memory of events was still fresh, the feeling of all classes in the Punjab, as *expressed in their leaders' addresses was one of intense relief at the prompt suppression by the effective methods of Martial Law out breaks which threatened to involve the whole province in bloodshed and ruin and which many of them regarded as the result of an*

" organised conspiracy". It may be noted here that both Mr. Gandhi and Mrs. Besant used similar language at the time. But as the memory of the horrors from which they had been saved grew faint, as the forces of agitation and intimidation came into operation, and the Policy of Government towards the promoters of rebellion showed a violent alteration the views of the weak and wavering changed. *A leading Muhammadan gentleman in the Punjab in May 1919, took a prominent part in presenting an address from the Muhammadans of the Province to the Lieutenant-Governor stating that the riots and disturbances were the result of an " organised conspiracy,"* but that the situation was soon got well in hand by using the speed and effective methods of Martial Law; and peaceful life is once more possible for the law-abiding citizens of our chief towns." In May, 1920, the same gentleman, now a Member of the Government of India, considers (see paragraphs 21 and 36 of the Government of India Despatch) that " there being no organised or pre-conceived conspiracy to subvert the British behind these disturbances, there was no open rebellion as alleged and no justification in consequence for the proclamation of Martial Law." He has also the hardihood to add that " the disturbances

on and after April 14th in the Districts of Gujranwala, Gujrat and Lyallpur were the result of the commotion caused by the Jallianwala Bagh affairs." His views as those of the only Indian Member of the Government of India and the only one who dissents from his colleagues have perhaps influenced the decision of the Home Government and make it necessary even at this late stage to show what they are worth. *Fortunately, they are not typical of those of the great mass of people in the Punjab, who, in war and peace, have proved themselves true to their salt and true to their word.*"

Now in this extract there are the following untruths: First of all, we are told that Mr. Gandhi and Mrs. Besant used similar language at the time, indicating that the disorders in the Punjab were the result of "an organised conspiracy." Neither Mr. Gandhi nor Mrs. Besant used any language, which, even by a stretch of imagination, could be interpreted in that sense. About certain deeds that had taken place in Ahmedabad Mr. Gandhi did say "there were clever men behind the lawless deeds and they showed concerted action." But he never said a word about anything in the Punjab. Similarly, Sir Michael O'Dwyer has failed to quote any

language of Mr. Besant in support of his contention. Mr. Besant's statement is quoted by the majority in their report on page 76. There is nothing in it which supports the theory of organised conspiracy.

Then to use the addresses in the way he has done is another illustration of his unscrupulousness. Firstly, he writes as if *all the addresses* made the statement about the organised conspiracy and approved of his methods in suppressing it. The address given by the Hindus said nothing of these matters and although it was practically extorted from them, it studiously kept silent on these questions. This then is an untruth.

Secondly, he must have known that the Muhammadan address as originally prepared and handed over to his Secretary contained no such statements at all, and that the alleged statements were interpolated while the address was in the custody of one of his minions. The fact could not have been unknown to him as he was a man who kept himself in close touch with every possible detail of everything relating to himself. The fact of the statement being in the address dawned on the unfortunate members, who had signed it believing that the address was as they had drafted and passed it,

only when they heard the address being read. Then it was too late to make any protest. This fact has been disclosed by and published under the authority of several members themselves. His reference to the inconsistency of conduct displayed in this matter by the Hon'ble Mian Mohomed Shafi, the only Member of the Government of India at the time of the Hunter Committee's Report, is not only ungenerous but misleading. He tried to get a similar statement inserted in the Hindu address but failed.

His third statement about the great mass of the people of the Punjab is also untrue. The great mass of the people in the Punjab have shown what they think of Sir Michael O'Dwyer's conduct during the Martial Law regime in the numerous meetings that have been held in the province during the last six months to protest against the horrors of those days. In every case they asked for his prosecution and impeachment.

Then look at his impertinence in talking of their being 'true to salt.' May we ask whose salt ?

He makes a point of the delay in the enquiry knowing fully that the people of the Punjab were crying for an enquiry from the very first and that it was delayed by his supporters.

The statements about Dr. Bashir are also false, the falsity of which has been exposed by the Doctor himself in a communication to the press. About the findings of the tribunals on which Sir Michael relies so much he knows that no evidence was given before them to prove the existence of an organised conspiracy and that all those findings are based on mere presumptions. His attacks on the Indian Members of the Committee have been adequately answered by the members themselves. They are at best a typical manifestation of his meanness. As to the untruthfulness of Sir Michael O'Dwyer's Government, Mr. C. F. Andrews has in a letter published in the Calcutta *Statesman* maintained that it has been already proved by the Commission of Enquiry itself that these officials circulated news which was false and suppressed news which was true.

Recruiting and War Funds.

The Congress Commissioners in their Report have dwelt at some length on the methods adopted by Sir Michael O'Dwyer in his recruiting and war loan compaigns. They are relevant to our enquiry as showing the administrative methods of the late Lieutenant-Governor, I give a few extracts below :—

"The evidence that we have collected and the judicial records that we have read conclusively

prove that the methods adopted for securing recruits and donations or loans travelled far beyond the line of moral and social pressure, nor were these methods unknown to Sir Michael O'Dwyer. Indeed conscription was openly talked of, suggested and advocated and we cannot help saying that open conscription would have been infinitely better than the so-called voluntarism, which was in effect worse than conscription, because the voluntarism pressed only the weakest and permitted the strong to go off scot free.

"Let us glance at the actuality. Sir Michael said at a meeting on the 4th of May, 1918, just after the Delhi pragramme had been settled: "200,000 men for the regular army, voluntarism if possible, conscription if necessary." Colonel Popham Young, speaking at the same meeting said "when deciding how to apportion the effort it is inevitable that many must be guided, must even be compelled."

At the same meeting Sir Michael O'Dwyer himself said as follows:—

'The contingency of failure of the voluntary system in certain areas is there and it would be cowardice not to face it. We have given our pledge

and we must take measures in time to secure its fulfilment. I believe that in the Punjab at any rate there is now a strong feeling in favour of some form of conscription to raise the necessary quotas, both within the province and as between the various provinces, the taking, for instance, of one fit man in ten or fifteen or twenty by lot, with the option of some pecuniary forfeit to be paid to the State.

'The men are wanted immediately. What therefore, appears necessary is that Government should take power to enforce the quotas allotted to provinces, and that all the necessary preparations should be made in advance on the distinct understanding that the measure will not be applied if the quotas are forthcoming on voluntary basis.'

"A circular was issued by the Punjab Government making suggestions for obtaining contributions which could only be given effect to, by using more than normal pressure. We give below one paragraph from the circular:

'I am to suggest that Deputy Commissioners might assist much in the campaign by estimating the contributions that might reasonably be expected from the various towns. In doing so they will

derive such assistance from the local income-tax returns, especially where the assessments have recently been revised by the special establishment. Income-tax returns furnish, too, a fairly reliable index to the relative financial condition of individuals who are expected to help the loan and a rough standard, which it is believed is already being applied in some districts. To judge of the adequacy of their investments in it, it would not be unreasonable to expect that on an average an assessee would be in a position to invest in the War Loan from half to one-fourth of the income on which he is actually assessed. Applying this rough test or others, which may be found suitable to local conditions, Deputy Commissioners should be in a position to see whether towns and villages or individuals in their jurisdiction are doing what is expected of them. The Deputy Commissioners should then, by special meetings, formation of local committees of Sahukars (money-lenders) and such expedients, endeavour to obtain the estimated sum as a minimum contribution.'

Acting on this principle the subordinate officials carried on recklessly a campaign of tyranny, compulsion, extortion and what not. There is plenty of evidence in the judicial records of the Province to

prove that all kinds of compulsion was used to get recruits and subscriptions and contributions to the war loan and other war funds. The Congress Commissioners have embodied some of this evidence in their Report. A perusal of the records of judical cases relating to the compulsion and exortion resorted to for recruiting purposes, and also for collecting subscriptions and contributions to war loan fund, makes one's blood boil in indigation. Not only men but even women were insulted and treated in the most cruel fashion. I cannot quote the evidence as many of the statements will not bear being read in public. I am afraid I have no space left to show how war loans and war funds were collected from the Punjab. Those who want to know must read the Congress Commissioners' Report.

Case for the Government.

So far I have discussed the Punjab disorders mainly from the peoples, point of view. Now I think it is my duty to state Government case also before you and examine its validity.

Briefly put the Government case is :—

(*a*) That the agitation against the Rowlatt Act to have it repealed by show of criminal force amounted to a criminal conspiracy.

(*b*) That even if it was not criminal originally it became so with the initiation of the *Satyagraha* movement.

(*c*) That the whole movement was anti-British and anti-Government. In proof they cite the shouts and other marks of Hindu Muhammadan unity on the *Ram Naumi* day.

(*d*) That although no overt acts were committed until after the firing at the Amritsar over-bridge on the 10th of April, the attitude of the mobs at Lahore and Amritsar having justified firing, the movement became one of 'open rebellion,' on the commission of murders, looting and burning at Amritsar and of acts of violence and defiance of authority at other places between the 11th and the 13th.

(*e*) That the handful of Europeans, official and non-official, in a vast hostile population, stood the chance of being annihilated, unless something drastic was done to show that they had the power to crush the 'rebellion.'

(*f*) That the shooting at Jallianwala Bagh produced the required effect and to get the full benefit of that drastic measure, it was necessary to supplement it by Martial Law, and to administer it intensively.

(*g*) That in an emergency like this, you cannot judge the conduct of the officials and the judges by ordinary standards of propriety, legality and fairness. And so on.

I am afraid I cannot admit the soundness of these arguments. The whole structure topples down if you once concede that British rule in India rests not on brute force, but on the tacit consent of the people. With that admission, the defiance of the united Indian public opinion by the Government of India in relation to the Rowlatt Act was wholly indefensible. The contention that the agitation for its repeal, supplemented by the *Satyagraha* movement, was a criminal conspiracy, is tantamount to saying that the peple have no remedy and no rights against the lawlessness of their Government except by violent revolution—a very dangerous doctrine to lay down.

It has been admitted by Mr. Miles Irving in his evidence that before the 10th the mobs were neither anti-Government nor anti-British.

Q.—Would it be consistent with the facts as you know them, to regard the outbreak of the 10th April as a case of protest against the deportation of

> Drs. Kitchlew and Satyapal which spontaneously developed into mob violence, marked by murder and incendiarism ?

A.—I think that is a very good account. It spontaneously developed. It flared up in a moment. I don't think people went out with that design."

The brutalities of the mob on the 10th May had necessitated some kind of drastic action but the action taken on the 11th, the 12th and the forenoon of the 13th had proved quite effetive and no further action was needed at Amritsar. Similarly, the situation at other places was well in hand before the 15th. The mere fact that during the worst days of the so-called 'rebellion' the attacks on Europeans were so few and far between (judged by their number in the Punjab) renders the argument (e) absolutely untenable. (f) has been answered by the finding of the Hunter Committee itself that it cannot be said that General Dyer's action saved the situation in the Punjab (P. 34). (g) Is an extraordinary proposition. Government servants are human beings no doubt, and you have to make certain allowance for racial anger and the desire for revenge, but if you lay down that, even in an emergency, Government

officers can do as they did in the Punjab, you place them in the same category with mobs, in fact, even worse. Mobs did what they did under a momentary impulse, their reason blinded by passion, but the Government officers acted throughout with deliberation, design and determination in a period extending over nearly two months. Lawlessness and violence by responsible Government officers is more heinous both legally and morally than that of the mobs. It ought to be judged by a more strict standard and punished even more severely than that committed by the mobs. Shall we place Sir Michael O'Dwyer, General Dyer, Col. Frank Johnson and others in the same category with the leaders of mobs at Amritsar, Kasur, Lahore and Gujranwala? The explanation then is that rulers of India do not *really* believe that British rule in India is founded on the tacit consent of the people. Rather it is based on the force of their bayonets and on the prestige of their arms. Secondly, their intelligence department is thoroughly inefficient and unreliable. Thirdly, the class of Indians whom they take into their confidence are mostly selfiish, unscrupulous and deceitful. Fourthly, they have a distrust and suspicion of the educated classes among almost to harted. Consequently they want to show in season and out

of season, that the educated classes do not represent the people of India and indulge in threats which are mere bluff.

It is upon that assumption that they continue to sit on the brink of a valcano, disregarding all warnings, all entreaties, all representations, until disaster overtakes them. Even then, they prefer to explain the eruption by extraneous considerations. They curse the 'agitators' forgetting that agitators only reap the crop sown by them. They also forget that it does not pay to be an agitator. On the other hand, it pays very well to be a sycophant. If still men with the brains of a Tilak, a Gokhale, a Gandhi, a Malaviya and an Arabindo Ghose prefer to be 'agitators' rather than 'loyalists', they do so under a sense of Duty which is compelling and irresistable.

Let the authorities once for all, understand that the educated classes are the mouthpiece of their countrymen, that the masses are whole-heartedly with them and that the so-called 'loyal' Indians, upon whom the authorities rely are no more than a set of selfish sycophants, who have their own axes to grind. That these gentlemen proved no more than a broken reed during the disturbances has been admitted by Martial Law

Commissions and other Martial Law authorities. Let them disabuse their minds of the false notion that they can more effectively and peacefully rule India merely by the show of prestige or of military force. But if they really believe in military force, let them frankly avow it, so that they may be practising no deception either on themselves or on the people of India.

Militarism knows no law and no principle. It does not care for justice. It represents force, brute force and knows only one law that of necessity. War is barbarism, militarism is applied barbarism. Judged from that standard every thing done by the Punjab Government and the Martial Law administrators was justified and needs no defence.

Conclusion.

I have now done with the story of the Punjab. I have given the story at some length, because I began by formulating certain charges against Sir Michael O'Dwyer at the commencement of my address, and it was my duty to make out a *prima facie* case in support of these charges. I hope and trust that I have made out my case to your satisfaction, that of all the persons who had anything to do with the introduction of Martial Law in the Punjab and with

the events that preceded and followed it, Sir Michael was the chief culprit. Indeed I may venture to assert that no man in the whole history of British Rule in India has done *such a great disservice to the British Empire and has brought such disgrace on the good name of the British nation as Sir Michael O'Dwyer.*

The root cause of all the evil, as I have pointed out before, is the Prussian conception of Government which dominates the minds of so many of our Anglo-Indian rulers of whom Sir Michael O'Dwyer was the type and which places the State as something above and beyond the people. It was that conception of Government which made it possible for Lord Chelmsford's Government to pass the Rowlatt Bill into law; it was the same conception which made it possible for Sir Michael O'Dwyer to deport Drs. Kitchlew and Satyapal and subsequently to have Martial Law declared in the Punjab. Every official who has had anything to do with this lamentable affair was filled with the same idea, namely, of making an example, 'teaching a lesson', 'creating moral effect' and 'restoring the prestige of Government' by terrorism, and frightfulness. General Dyer boasted that he had acted with that motive. Colonel O'Brien, Capt.

Doveton, Lieutenant Col. Macrae, Lieutenant Col. Johnson, Mr. Bosworth Smith, and even some of the Judges who presided at the Trial of Martial Law offenders were all inspired by the same ideal, which made many of them inhuman in their dealings with the Punjabees during the terrible days of the Martial Law. We had the sad spectacle of a Government and its high officials neglecting to take the most essential precautions for preventing unnecessary sacrifice of life and property in the carrying out of their plans. They admit that in no cases, where they resorted to firing and shooting, did they make any provision for first-aid to the wounded. In some cases they even refused to make over the bodies of the dead to their relatives. In others they took no notice of the dead. We have also evidence of the fact that troops destroyed property wholesale in the districts through which they passed, that even high officials of the standing of Deputy Commissioner's exacted all kinds of contributions from the people within their respective jurisdictions; that they obtained articles of food and other necessities of life without paying for them, and in addition realised levies and fines and penalties from whole populations. We have also evidence of the fact that in giving effect to the orders of Martial Law

Tribunals about the forfeiture of property inhuman cruelties were practised on the women and children of the 'offenders'. In some cases they were thrown on the streets and were not even allowed to take sufficient clothing for the night and this was done not by subordinate officials but by high officers.

I have narrated the events of Sir Michael O'Dwyer's administration at some length in order to show that it was all through, a regime of terrorism and frightfulness in the literal sense of these words and that it was only carried to its logical conclusion in the months of April and May, 1919. In the words used by Mr. Montagu with reference to the action of General Dyer, the ideals which Sir Michael O'Dwyer had set before himself were 'terrorism, humiliation and subordination' and they reached their climax in the promulgation and administration of Martial Law. Witness after witness has appeared before the Hunter Committee and has practically boasted of his acts of cruelty and oppression. General Dyer himself has justified all that he did. Col. Frank Johnson is proud of everything that was done by him. He said in one case that that was one of the few brain waves, he had in his life. Captain Doveton ,Col. O'Brien, Major Bosworth Smith all

testify in the same spirit. There was only one incident for which Col. Frank Johnson expressed his regret, and that was the flogging of the marriage party. Others were not sorry for anything, and said that they would do the same thing if ever there was a chance of doing so. Here then we have the tragedy of the situation.

We believe that the principles and conduct of these men are entirely opposed to the traditions and the policy of the British Government, particularly the policy that underlies the Reform Scheme. We are afraid, however, that in the Punjab the majority of the bureaucracy are of the same mentality. The vast majority of the non-official European community is also of the same mind and so are a good many of the European and American Missionaries. If such is the mentality of so many members of the Indian Civil Service, who, after all, are the real rulers of the country and in whom is vested the task of administration, what is the remedy. In the face of the statements made before the Hunter Committee by European witnesses, the wholesale defence of General Dyer and others by the Anglo-Indian Press and the Anglo-Indian community, the raising of memorial funds for him and in his honour, and last

but not the least, the resolution passed by the House of Lords, how can we Indians, possibly, assume that the British in England and the European community in India generally have accepted, in sincerity, the Reform Scheme and the principles that underlie it? These principles imply that if not at once at least in a short time we must be free in our own country, with power to make and unmake our Governments, subject only to the maintenance of the Imperial tie, it being our interest and right to shorten the period of transition as much as possible. The Indian Civil Service and the European community of India and the House of Lords evidently think otherwise. They conceive it to be in their interest to prolong the period of transition by all methods open to them and many of them are frankly anxious to defeat the Reform Scheme and revert to the old system of Government. If then the struggle between these two interests is to be conducted on the lines that were in evidence in the Martial Law regime, it seems to be absolutely futile to think of friendly co-operation between the two interests. It is all very well for those who are still in power to ask us to drop the matter and let by-gones be by-gones. I wish I could ask you to do the same. I am not actuated by any vindictive and revengeful motive, and I fully believe

that my people are not; but how can we sit silent and let the matter drop in the face of all that has happened in India and in England, in connection with the events of last year until full and complete justice has been done and until steps have been taken to prevent a recurrence of the tragic state of things. The Government of India and the British Cabinet have gone out of their way to praise and belaud a man whom we consider to be the chief culprit in this whole drama of oppression and tyranny. If that praise is justified, and if we acquiesce in it by our silence, then surely we deserve all that was done to us. If not, then, it is our duty to press for the punishment and prosecution of Sir Michael O'Dwyer.

The Punjab tragedy was not a provincial affair, but a national one. Our manhood, our self-respect, our national dignity, nay, our very existence as a nation, depends on our having the principles and practices of Sir Michael O'Dwyer condemned, and once for all abrogated. We owe it to ourselves, to our women, to our children and also to those unborn, to fight it out and not let the matter drop without obtaining full and unqualified redress, and without obtaining effective guarantees that it will not be possible for any one, however high his position in

the Government of the country, to enact such like tragedies again. It is our duty also to repudiate as emphatically as we can the fundamentaly erroneous, I was going to say, vicious and Prussian conception which found frequent expression in Sir Michael O'Dwyer's speeches, that the security of life and property is the primary duty of Government. The security of life and property is only a means to an end. What is the end? The uplifting of the human race and its progress towards the fullness of freedom, which means towards divinity. PEACE IS A GOOD THING, BUT LIFE IS STILL BETTER, says Rabindranath Tagore in one of his essays on nationalism.

If the British rulers of India propose to give us mere security of life and property by denying us honour and liberty we must refuse to have them. THERE IS NO LIFE WITHOUT FREEDOM AND THERE IS NO FREEDOM WITHOUT "SWARAJYA" OR SELF-GOVERNMENT.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe I give expression to your sentiments when I say to our rulers, that although the British Government is mighty enough to crush all our efforts by their military power, any success they achieved by military efforts would be

a very expensive one. The British *Raj* is no longer synonymous with justice and fair-play in the mind of the average citizen and the more it is dragged into the mire by men like Sir Michael O'Dwyer, the more it will lose in what has hitherto constituted its boast.

We, on our part, are determined not to let our *morale* go under, to fight only a clean fight. We shall continue to condemn unhesitatingly and unequivocally all those who commit violence, or insult or humilitate women, irrespective of their nationality, or who commit such acts of inhumanity as characterised the Dyers, Dovetons, Johnsons, O'Briens and others of the Punjab tragedy. If all this fails to bring us the necessary relief, I for one hope and believe that it will not, well, then the future is in the lap of the gods. I want in your name and in the name of the country which we have the honour to represent to tell Mr. Montagu and through him the British Cabinet, that we accept in full the principles that he has laid down in the speech which he made in the course of the Dyer Debate in the House of Commons. For our part we are fully prepared to act on those principles, and to cherish the connection with the British Common-

wealth as a desirable privilege; but we shall be deceiving ourselves as well as Mr. Montagu if we do not tell him also that in the light of the events that happened in the Punjab last year, the people of this country require something more than speeches and resolutions and despatches to prove that the British Cabinet and the British people are equally sincere and equally earnest for the principles laid down by Mr. Montagu. Here let me make one thing clear. If partnership in the Common-wealth means full freedom to us in India, with responsibility for the burden of the Common-wealth to the extent of our interest in it, we accept that ideal of partnership but if partnership in the Empire means and includes the permanence of racial or alien domination in any shape, form or degree in the Government of India, then we do not accept that ideal. We are determined at no distant date to be entirely free in our country, in the same sense as South Africans are free in South Africa, Canadians in Canada, Australians in Australia and the British at home. Any qualification of that ideal we will not admit. All those Europeans who are domiciled in this country are our countrymen, and it shall be our duty to respect their rights in the same way as we shall respect the rights of any other community in India. But beyond this

we are not prepared to go. Further we are also determined not to let ourselves be used as willing tools to crush the liberties of the rest of the world. We of the Indian National Congress have declared that we are quite fit for complete autonomy even now, yet we did accept, however inadequate and unsatisfactory, the instalment given to us, as evidence of the *bona fides* of the British statesmen. We were prepared to work out the Reform Scheme to the best of our ability as a stepping stone to full responsible Government, but we must frankly tell Mr. Montagu that the events of the Punjab have shaken our faith in the motives of those who seek our co-operation in the ostensible working out of the Reform Scheme.

I will conclude this part of my address by stating in brief what we want. (*a*) We want complete and unequivocal repudiation and condemnation of Sir Michael O'Dwyer and if possible his prosecution and punishment. We also want that an open enquiry be held into the methods adopted by Sir Michael O'Dwyer in the recruiting compaign and in raising war loans and war funds. (*b*) We want equal condemnation and punishment of the Dovetons, Johnsons, O'Briens and Smiths as well as of all

those Indians who helped them in enacting the outrages of the last year. The compulsory retirement of men like Bosworth Smith does not satisfy us (*c*) We want the release of the remaining Martial Law prisoners and all the men that are still *rotting in jails under convictions of the Special Tribunals and the Martial Law Courts*. We shall be quite ready to have such of them retried by ordinary courts as were accused of murders or other charges of that nature; but we refuse to accept the judments of the Special and the Martial Law Courts as good judicial pronouncements. (*d*) We insist that all the loss incurred by the people of the Punjab by the vagaries of the troops and the officials in the course of the Martial Law administration be made good and that all punitive fines and penalties imposed and recovered be remitted and returned (*e*) We demand that all the disqualifications that are involved in the conviction of men by the Martial Law Tribunals be set aside, either by law or by a general order of the Government. (*f*) We further require that an open enquiry be held into the charges of bribery, corruption, extortion and torture that have been made by the witnesses before the Congress Commissioners against Police Officers of whatever rank, and other officials. (*g*) We also insist that if the authors of

the Reform Scheme want a fair trial for it, they must remove from the Punjab all such officers as were connected with the outrages, as a proof of their *bona fides.* (*h*) If there be any others in the Punjab or elsewhere who do not accept the principles of the Reform Scheme they also must go, even if they have to be retired on suitable pensions. They should not be there to defeat the Reform Scheme by the exercise of powers that are still left to them to a very great extent by the Reform Scheme itself. The Department of Law and the control of the police is entirely in their hands and unless the people of India get control of these departments they cannot effectively prevent the higher officials from exercising these powers high-handedly and arbitrarily as they did in the Punjab and as, to our knowledge and regret, they are doing even now in some places (*i*) The Government of India too must shoulder their share of the responsibility for the Punjab tragedy. Their decision on the Hunter Committee's Report was a foregone conclusion. All the credit which they were entitled to, for their efforts to shorten the period of Martial Law has been discounted by their present justification of its continuance. If the view which the British Cabinet has taken of General Dyer's action and of the excesses of the Martial Law

administration is correct (and it is much below the reality), then I submit the least that Lord Chelmsford can do with honour to himself is to retire from his high office. If Mr. Austan Chamberlain thought it his duty to resign his office on account of the verdict of the Mesopotamia Commission, I submit there is enough in the Hunter Committee's Report (of both the Majority and the Minority) which should induce Lord Chelmsford to take the same honourable course. The Viceroy and his Cabinet have been guilty of gross dereliction of duty in failing to check the vagaries of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, and in failing to exercise that power of control which law and tradition vested in them. They let the people of the Punjab sulk and suffer under the impression that there was no one to hear their cries.

Sir Sankaran Nair.

Under the circumstances the country's demand for the recall of the Viceroy seems to be just and proper.

Speaking of the Government of India, I must not omit to make mention of the noble stand made by our distinguished countryman, Sir Sankaran Nair, against the policy of the Government relating to the Punjab His forcible protests, ending in his resignation from his high office, are worthy of the

best traditions of Indian patriotism and will be remembered as long as India is articulate. His bold, blunt and burning love of justice and fairplay his high sense of duty, and absolute disregard of personal losses are such as to make every Indian proud of him.

Narrative still incomplete.

Ladies and Gentlemen, before I close this account of the wrongs inflicted on the Punjab, I must tell you that the narrative is by no means exhaustive For want of time and space I have omitted many facts and incidents, as telling as those related, and I believe there are many more which have not yet been brought to light. The Punjab Provincial Congress Committee have resolved to undertake the work of investigation from the point where it was left by the Congress Commissioners, so as to complete the record as far as practicable. Nor must I pass to the next subject without recording the bright side of this gruesome tale. It is true that Sir Michael O'Dwyer did succeed in terrorising and overawing the Punjabees for a while, but as soon as the first shock was over, the people recovered almost instantously. Those who were arrested and prosecuted, behaved most heroically, those whom they had left behind including

little children and women, bore their misfortunes nobly.

Ratan Devi.

To the *eternal glory of Indian womanhood*, Ratan Devi defied the Curfew order of General Dyer, and watched all night by the corpse of her dead husband in the Jallianwala Bagh. The boys who were accused of waging war against His Majesty the King, never showed the slightest anxiety about their lives.

L Harkishan Lal.

Of the victims of official aggression there is one man whose name I must mention, who by his cool and calm behaviour, his bold and defiant attitude, his manly notions of self-respect and honour, his stoic indifference to consequences, set an example for others and earned the ever-lasting respect of his countrymen. I refer, of course, to Lala Harkishan Lal.

Having passed through the fire of Martial Law, the Punjab is to-day purer, stronger, more advanced, more determined, more patriotic and very much more united. The so-called backward Muslim masses are vying with their Hindu countrymen in showing a united political front, and the Sikhs (young and old) are out-doing themselves. No words can describe

their enthusiasm for political regeneration and their readiness to suffer and sacrifice.

Indian Unity.

If Martial Law has produced such good results in the Punjab itself, it has done still greater wonders in the cause of Indian unity. The political consciousness of the people of India has advanced by at least ten years. I believe I am giving expression to your sentiments, Ladies and Gentlemen, when I say that the country owes a deep debt of gratitude to the Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, the Hon. Pandit Moti Lal Nehru, the most revered Mahatma M. K. Gandhi, and Messrs. C. R. Dass, Jayakar and Tyebji. Our immortal Rabindra Nath Tagore's letter to the Viceroy will ever remain the character of national self-respect and dignity, for the future generations of India. As a Punjabee I must offer my gratitude to all who have esposed the cause of my province in her hour of affliction. As an Indian I am proud of the stand made by the country. Surely, it is a new day and a most cheering day to find that in this matter the Hon'ble Mian Mahomed Shafi should be on the same side, as the most uncompromising Indian radical politician, be he of Bengal or of Maharashtra. The one Englishman, whose name I must mention

with gratitude is Mr. C. F. Andrews, who is now one of us. Nor can we withhold our praise from the Indian members of the Hunter Committee, for their independence of character and for the statesmanlike view they have taken of the affairs in the Punjab. The country's best thanks are due to them for their lucid and masterly report.

Khilafat Question.

They say that every cloud has its silver lining. To me it looks as if the Punjab tragedy has a golden hue, with the memory of the Amritsar martyrs, with the pictures of Ratan Devi, Madan Mohan and Khushi Ram engraved on our hearts, with the recollection of the dying Muslim urchin, who invoked the "*Hind Musalman ki Jai*" with his last breath, with the example of the sufferers of the Martial Law, we will march on to our goal of national unity and national freedom, with hope and confidence.

The second question that has been referred to the Special Session of the Congress, for consideration and decision is the question of the "Khilafat." Seventy millions of our Muslim countrymen are stirred over it. The question has two aspects: the religious and the political. We of the Indian National Congress have no jurisdiction to go into the

merits of the Khilafat question from the religious point of view. In the words of Mr. Leland Buxton "it does not in the least matter what Professor this or Doctor that thinks the Muslims ought to believe. What does matter is, that the vast majority of *Sunni* Muslims do believe that the Sultan of Turkey is their Khalifa and the interests of Islam require him to be the head of a large, powerful and independent State." The Mahamadan Law-books define the boundaries of such a State.

There is a perfect unanimity among the Muhammadans of India on the religious merits of the question. I do not believe there could be more than one person in a million among the *Sunni* Muhammadans of India who entertains any doubts in the matter. We may then take it for granted that the interpretation put upon this matter by the Central Khilafat Committee is correct. It was a matter for our Muhammadan countrymen to decide and they have decided it. They contend that the Turkish Peace Treaty violates the fundamentals of Islam, prevents them from fulfilling their religious obligations, makes it impossible for them to maintain friendly relations with a nation which is the cause of it.

They also maintain that the Turkish Settlement has violated the solemn pledges given to the people of India by British statesmen during the War.

In the first place, after the declaration of the War between England and Turkey in 1914, the Government of India on behalf of His Majesty's Government as also the Government of France and Russia promptly issued a Proclamation assuring "His Majesty's Most Loyal Muslim Subjects" that "no question of a religious character was involved" in the war "and disclaiming any British designs against the Holy Places of Islam." Again in January 1918 speaking in the name of the whole Empire the British Prime Minister made the following unambiguous and remarkable pronouncement:—

"NOR ARE WE FIGHTING TO DEPRIVE TURKEY OF ITS CAPITAL OR OF THE RICH AND RENOWNED LANDS OF ASIA MINOR WHICH ARE PREDOMINENTLY TURKISH IN RACE." Finally, came the armistice with Turkey and it is important to recall that it was signed on the basis of President Wilson's Twelfth point, (one of his famous 14 points set forth in his message to the

Congress, dated the 8th January 1918), which is follows:

THAT THE TURKISH PORTIONS OF THE PRESENT OTTOMAN EMPIRE SHOULD BE ASSURED OF SECURE SOVEREIGNTY, BUT THE OTHER NATIONALITIES NOW UNDER TURKISH RULE SHOULD BE ASSURED SECURITY OF LIFE AND AUTONOMOUS DEVELOPMENT."

Now, ask the Muslims, have these promises and pledges been redeemed? It is the bare truth to say that in the treaty presented to the Turkish Plenipotentaries on May 11th last and since signed by the Turkish Government, every single principle contained in the declarations I have cited above, has been palpably violated. Non-interference with the Muslim religious practises and obligations, non-molestations of Islamic Holy Places and respect for Turkish territorial and National integrity have all been *thrown overboard.*" This is the Muslim contention and the whole of India has accepted it as true.

So much then for the Muhammadan point of view.

But there are in my judgment other issues also involved in the Turkish Peace Treaty which deserve consideration. I maintain that any further exten-

sion of the British Empire in Asia is detrimental to the interests of India and fatal to the liberties of the human race. The British have frequently used Indian troops to conquer various parts of Asia and Africa. For a long time there was an unwritten law which every European Chancelory considered binding on itself, that non-European troops were not to be used in any European war. This was abolished in the last war. African troops and Indian troops were used during and after the war by the Allies in Europe. Black troops were in occupation of Germany and possibly they may be still there. Gurkhas were, for some time, stationed in Ireland. I do not, of course, resent the abolition of the invidious social bar. From that point of view, I may even welcome it, but surely it widens the scope of militarism. British suzerainty in Arabia and British occupation of Mesopotamia involves the practical absorption of Persia and Central Asia, and perhaps later on of Afghanistan as well, into the British Empire. What has happened in India will happen in these countries too, *i.e.*, the general population will be disarmed and a number of them enrolled and drilled in the army. With the memory of the Dyer Debates fresh in our minds; let my countrymen imagine the effect of that procedure on their own liberties as well as

those of the rest of the world. The prospect of having Arabian, Persian and Afghan regiments in India cannot be pleasant to those of us who are working for the freedom of this country. It may be said that the contingency is very remote and perhaps fanciful. I am afraid I cannot agree in that view. What is remote to-day becomes near to-morrow. If the British Imperialist has no scruples in using Indian troops in Egypt, Persia, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Syria and Central Asia, why will he have any in using the troops he raises in these countries against us? The Hindu-Muslim problem will become ten times more troublesome and dangerous, if this turns out to be true.

Then there is another aspect of the question. If the Muslim population of these countries continue to resist British attempts at occupation which they are likely to do for years, the Indian Army will be in constant requisition to fight their battles in those regions, which means a constant and never-ending drain on our resources, both human and economic. The best interests of India, therefore, require that the Muslim countries in Western Asia should remain free and independent. Their amalgamation in the British Empire even under the pretence

of mandatory jurisdiction, is likely to be extremely harmful to us. We know what these mandates really mean. The British have to maintain 80,000 troops in Mesopotamia and the French the same number in Syria. They have spent money like water on these territories even after the war. This is not being done for the benefit of these backward countries. Several wars are going on at this minute in what were Turkish territories before.

It may be contended that this view ignores the League of Nations and the United States. Well, gentlemen, there is no such thing as the League of Nations. Great Britain and France are the League. As for the United States, they are averse to any entanglements in foreign politics. They will not raise their little finger to save the liberties of the world unless theirs are in danger.

But it may also be said that this view ignores the possibility of Labour coming into power in Great Britain. Well, so long as Labour does not actually come into power it will be foolish for us to count upon the contingency in deciding what attitude we shall take on current problems, which brook no delay. For the present it seems that junkerism and militarism have obtained a fresh lease of life in

Great Britain. For evidence one has to read carefully the speeches made in the course of the Dyer Debate in both the Houses of Parliament. These speeches would not have been delivered in 1917 and 1918.

The question then resolves itself into the following:—

(*a*) Are we voluntarily and of our free will going to acquiesce in British Junkerism crushing Muslim liberties in Western Asia, and trample upon Indian religious susceptibilities without joining our protest with that of our Muslim countrymen against this immoral and unjust attempt?

(*b*) Are we to sit silent and let the British Junkers ride rough shod over the pledges under which they obtained our country's help in the war against Turkey?

(*c*) Are we going to lose this opportunity of cementing the Hindu-Muslim *Entente* for the common purpose of Indian liberties in India, and Muslim liberties in Muslim countries?

We, of the Indian National Congress, have always believed that the fabric of Indian liberties cannot be built safe and secure except upon the

foundation of a close understanding between the two communities. The British bureaucrats have from time to time been deliberately playing the one against the other, and for a time they succeeded. Now is the time for us to convince our Muslim brothers that we were and are sincere in our desire for Muslim friendship. The bureaucrat may now want to play the Hindus against the Muslims. In fact they are already at the game. It was the spectacle of Hindu-Muslim unity at Amritsar that finally exasperated Sir Michael O'Dwyer and drove him mad. The Hindu-Muslim unity was declared to be anti-British for no reason whatsoever except that to Anglo-Indian bureaucrats, it was an unpleasant spectacle. It was not anti-Indian when they freely used the Muslims to denounce the Hindus, but it became anti-British, the moment Muslims began to fraternise with the Hindus. Such is the mentality of so many of the Anglo-Indian bureaucrats.

I do not believe there are any Indian Muslims who want Muslim sovereignty in India, but if there be any such we should not be afraid of them. If it came to it, we know how to defend our liberties with or without British aid. How long are we going to be afraid of shadows and be deceived by imaginery

fears set before us as a justification of despotic rule? But all this is on the assumption that there is going to be a fight. If or one do not believe that there is any likelihood of one. The Muslims of India do not want to turn out the British; even if they wanted it they could not do so. What they need and ask for is our moral and constitutional support in the present crisis regarding the Khilafat, and we should have no hesitation in giving it to them unreservedly.

I think it is a perfectly legitimate and constitutional demand that the Indian troops should no more be used anywhere outside India. They were taken out to defend the Empire when the Empire was in danger. The war which threatened the whole Empire is over and the troops sent by the dominions have returned totheir homes. So should ours. The Indian army exists to defend the Indian Empire and not for an aggressive Imperial policy of extension and expansion.

As to how far the Hindus should go with their Muslim countrymen in the latter's campaign of non-co-operation is a question which it is for you to discuss and decide. All that I can say at this stage is that we should go as far as we can, consistently with our duty to the country, even if we have to suffer.

The Hindu-Muslim unity betokens the dawn of a new day in the history of India and it will be extremely foolish and shortsighted to throw this chance which only comes once perhaps in a century on the bidding of those who worship at the shrine of Dyerism.

The prospect of Hindu-Muslim unity has already brightened the horizon and outlook of many an Indian who had taken to dispair. It has cheered many a dying patriot at Amritsar and other places.

Mr. Maqbul Mohamed of Amritsar has in his evidence before the Congress Commissioners related two touching incidents which are worth mentioning here. Speaking of the pathetic scenes he witnessed after the firing on the carriage bridge at Amritsar, on the 10th of April, he says :—

"I witnessed many pathetic scenes and some gruesome sights. I saw a corpse actually with an eye-ball and the whole brain blown out. *I heard a dying man gasping "Hindu Mussalman ki Jai."* A boy of 16 or 17 years of age lay wounded with his entrails protruding, having been hit on the belly. When Dr. Dhanpat Rai Salaria and I approached him, he whispered: "I am dying, attend to my brethren.

"*Hindu Mussalman ki Jai.*" The next moment he died. Many similar instances of notable sacrifice I noticed when I was pouring water into the mouths of the dying."

One word more and I will have finished this part of my address. It has been pointed out to me by well meaning friends that in supporting the Muslim claim for the maintenance of the Turkish Empire, I am advocating Imperialism to which I am otherwise so bitterly opposed. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, I do desire the destruction of Imperialism but I do not desire the destruction of some Empires for the benefit of others. In my judgment, Imperialism should be eliminated from the affairs of men and federation of sisterly states should take its place, but so long as there are Empires, it is not in the interests of humanity that some of them should be dissolved for the enlargement and glorification of others. In the present state of world politics, the liberty of such states as are now being created by the dissolution of the Turkish Empire is not worth even a day's purchase. Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia are being absorbed in the British and French Empires. Arabia and Kurdistan and Armenia cannot but be vassal States. Turkey itself, under the Treaty, is

hardly in a better position than the Nizam of Hyderabad. In an unguarded moment Lloyd George has said: "We have got Constantinople. We have got Mesopotamia. We have got Palestine." The Allies would have been perfectly justified in insisting on establishing autonomous Government in all the component parts of the Turkish Empire, with a tie of federation joining them all for purposes of defence. But as the matter at present stands, Muslim independence is entirely gone. What Arabia, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Syria, Kurdistan and Anotolia are getting is only a shadow and not the substance.

It is impossible to believe that the British and the French quarrel over the oil of Mosul are all disinterested and in the interests of the Muslim world. France, Italy and Great Britain have just made a treaty defining their economic interests in these territories, without consulting Turkey.

In my judgment the position of the Turks in Anotolia and Constantinople is worse than that of Germany and of the Austrians in Austria. It cannot be said that the Treaty secures them the sovereignty of Thrace or of the Turkish parts of the Empire or of the rich and renowned

lands of Asia Minor. In an article in the *Servant of India*, dated 19th August 1920, our friend Mr. C. F. Andrews has explained the meaning of that sentence. He quotes chapter and verse for the following opinion :—

Furthermore, we have now the fact brought to light, that every other Allied powers appears to regard the British as paramount in Constantinople, just as the French are now regarded as paramount in Aleppe and Damascus and the Greaks as paramount in Smyrna and Adrianople. All the military defence of Constantinople are in the hands of the British. The Sultan himself, his Vizier, and his Cabinet sign dutifully and unanimously British orders. Recalcitrant officials have been effectively dealt with. Financial control has been taken from the Turkish Government; and the Sultan has been made, not only a prisoner in his own palace—to all intents and purposes,—but also practically a pauper and a mendicant, dependent on the hated foreigner for every penny of his income. It is this situation, which has made Europe regard the British military occupation as complete and lasting.

Reform Rules and Regulations.

It is not my intention to detain you long over the Reform Rules and Regulations. The Parliament has finally

passed them and they have already been put into operation. My attitude towards the Reform Scheme may be summed up in one sentence. It was one of partial relation in 1918, it sank into one of depression in 1919, it changed almost into one of despair in 1920. From the frankness that characterised the statements made in the Joint Report of the Secretary of State and the Viceroy, I concluded that they meant exactly what they had said. But soon after, the resolution relating to the Arms Act and the Local Self-Government and the action of the Government in the matter of admitting Indians into the commissioned ranks of the Indian Army, disillusioned me. Then came the Reform Act, with its reservations and limitations. The way in which the Secretary of State has been encumbering Indian finances and sanctioning increase after increase in the salaries and allowance of the civil and millitary service, the rules that have been made for the selection of such Indian Civil Servants as are to be nominated in India, the latest development of policy in regard to currency, exchange, and reverse bills, and last but not the least the tenderness which has been shown in dealing with the culprits in the Punjab tragedy have shattered all my hopes. The Reform Scheme as originally formulated, carried in its bosom

the germs of disease. The germs have so fearfully developed since then that Colonel Wedgewood was perfectly justified in arguing that "the people of India think and rightly think, that the rules and regulations and the decisions of the Joint Committee have whittled down the recommendations of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report and have made the Act, as it is put into operation now, far worse than the recommendations of the original Report led them to expect." Now I must say that in one or two respects the Reform Act has made an improvement on the original scheme, but on the whole it has disappointed the hopes that were raised by the latter. Nor is this any matter for wonder. The Rules and Regulations have been framed by the bureaucracy and represent their mind. The people of India have had very little to say in the drafting of them, and what little they said has gone unheeded. The restrictions imposed on the selection of candidates, the refusal to enfranchise the wage-earning classes and woman, the constitution of the territorial constituencies and the almost autocratic powers given to the Governors, have considerably reduced the value of the Reforms, even such as they were. The distinction between dismissed Government servants and dismissed or suspended lawyers and between rural and urban

constituencies is on the face of it absurd. The tenderness shown towards European commercial interests is significant and even more significant is the anxiety to keep out of the councils the leading victims of Martial Law. In the Punjab, Indian Trade and Commerce remains unrepresented and also the depressed classes and the wage-earners. The Rules of procedure are as reactionary as the ingenuity of the bureaucracy could make them. In fact, all round, so far as the rules and regulations are concerned, the bureaucracy have won and the Indian people have lost. My friend, Mr. V. J. Patel, has returned to India perhaps sadder and wiser for his troubles. He will, I am sure, throw much more light on the subject than I can. It has been found that blood is thicker than water. It has happened in this case as it did in the case of Morley-Minto reforms. It will continue to be like that until the people of the India make up their minds that what they want is the whole loaf and not merely half of it. I would have no objection to take even the half, provided I was sure that the half offered was not selected by the bureaucracy. The bureaucracy is so adept in the art of mixing and cooking that the half which they propose to retain, contains all the nourishment of the whole leaving the

other half worse than chaff. They manage it so skilfully that in the process of doughing they mix many a germ of disease in the half which they propose to let you have. It will be a marvel of good fortune, if with all the distinctions of Hindus, Mussulmans, Sikhs and Christians, of urban and rural, of Brahmans and Non-Brahmans, of residents and non-residents, of British subject and those of Native States, of military and civil, made in the rules and regulations, we are still able to evolve a national spirit which will rise above these differences and consolidate us into one people, with a will to live and prosper as a free nation.

Non-Co-operation.

At the meeting of the All-India Congress Committee, which sanctioned the convening of this special session, it was proposed by Mr. Gandhi that, as a protest against the Turkish Peace Treaty and the decision of the Government in regard to the Punjab affairs, that Committee should recommend a programme of Non-co-operation to the country. Mr. Gandhi's programme of Non-co-operation includes the boycott of the Reformed Councils. The All-India Congress Committee considered that it was not within its competence to accept this proposition as it was opposed to the Resolution of the Amritsar Congress

relating to the Reform Scheme. It did not, at the same time, think it right to dispose of the matter without giving the country, as a whole, an opportunity of pronouncing on it. So it has referred the whole matter to this Special Session.

The question has since then been widely discussed in the country, on the platform and in the press. The Central Khilafat Committee under the leadership of Mr. Gandhi have already started their campaign of Non-co-operation. Some Provincial Congress Committees have, by a majority of votes, accepted the principle of Non-co-operation but have recommended no action, pending the decision of this assembly. The question is very much agitating the public mind and has divided the country into two opposing camps. On both sides are ranged revered and respected leaders. Much feeling has been imported into the discussion. Under the circumstances, I have decided that, as President of this assembly, the proper course for me at this stage is to refrain from expressing any opinion on the subject.

Past Practice.

I am aware that in the past Presidents have generally discussed all important political questions of the day in

their presidential addresses, but then until very recently the country was practically unanimous on all questions which the Congress was expected to deal with.

On the other hand, I believe there is an unwritten tradition that the Congress President, as the spokesman of the country, is expected to deal only with questions on which the country is unanimous or almost unanimous. There is a great ideal of wisdom in that tradition. If the Congress is to maintain its character as a National Assembly, those who are selected for the office of the President must not be partisans in the ordinary sense of the term. Whatever his personal opinions, the President cannot be speaking for, and in the name of the country, if he makes a pronouncement on which the country is not unanimous. If his views do not happen to coincide with those of the majority, both he and the Congress would find the situation rather awkward. The President should not try to anticipate the decision of the Congress on a question on which the country is so sharply divided as it is on the question before us. I therefore, think that the best interests of the country and the traditions of the high office to which you have elected me, require that for

the present, and in this address, I should say nothing on this much debated question. In deciding to do so, I am adopting a course which, in my judgment, will enable you hereafter to maintain the National character of this assembly, and which will also have the additional merit of not narrowing the field from which to select your future Presidents. In these days of active political life, when every new day the country may be expected to be confronted with problems on which there is room for differences of opinion among the best and the most respected of the country's leaders, you cannot afford to select your Presidents from amongst men who have kept aloof from active political life. No person who is actively interested in the political life of his country can possibly remain nuetral on any important questions on the merest chance of being called upon to preside over a session of the Congress. Nor would such an office-seeker be worthy of this high office. The Congress Presidents must continue to be selected, as far as possible, from among men who have been in the forefront of the political life of the country. It should not be difficult for many among them, to be absolutely impartial when presiding over discussions of controversial subjects, in spite of their having their own personal opinions one way or the other.

President Mouth-piece of the country.

In my humble judgment, the President of the Indian National Congress is the mouth-piece of the country only on questions on which the country is unanimous or practically unanimous. Acting on this principle, the moment I decided to accept the honour to which I was called by the vote of the All-India Congress Committee, I made up my mind to follow this course. Since then I have devoted much thought to it but I have not seen any reason to change my opinion. I hope and trust that my decision will meet with your approval. I have my personal opinion on the questions involved in the programme of Non-Co-operation but during the session of the Congress I will conduct the proceedings without taking side.

Co-operation Examined.

This, however, does not prevent me from making some general observations on the subject. Before we consider Non-co-operation, let us start with co-operation. Co-operation of the people with the Government is based on one of the two assumptions, either that the Government represents them, or that the Government is there to protect their interests. Now in India the first of these two assumptions cannot hold good. The second is unhappily in the course of being shat-

tered to pieces, if not already gone. Co-operation with Government, again, is of two kinds; one enforcible by law and therefore compulsory, for example the payment of taxes, or serving the army under conscription; the other is voluntary, for example accepting Government service or joining the councils and so on. In the case of the former, every refusal is punishable. As for the latter, there again you have to distinguish between co-operation which is obviously for country's benefit and that which is not so. Co-operation determined solely or mainly by economic considerations can only be refused, if we can find economic alternatives. Co-operation inspired by considerations of honour and dignity can be easily refused if the mentality of the people regarding honour and dignity can be changed. Last but not the least, in the same class you may consider co-operation, which gives you opportunities of serving your country by attacking the citadels of power and privilege from the inside.

Co-operation or refusal of it, then, must be judged by (*a*) its obligatory or voluntary nature (*b*) by its economic consequences (*c*) by its inherent morality and (*d*) by its utility as a weapon of attack or defence.

Co-operation which is immoral or which makes you a tool of a foreign bureaucracy or which leaves you no option but to give effect to their orders, stands on an entirely different footing from one which is obviously for the benefit of the country, similarly co-operation, which is inspired by economic necessity stands on a different footing from the one which is solely or mainly based on considerations of honour and dignity. Then again you must consider if your refusal of co-operation proceeds from the desire to make an immediate effective impression on the Government or from the motive of habituating the people to take their destiny in there own hands.

These, then, are the issues involved in the great question of Non-co-operation.

Interests of the People.

With your permission, I may also sound a general note of warning. We are passing through critical times. The minds of men are in ferment not only in this country of ours, but all over the world. Ideals, ideas, principles, convictions, sentiments, opinions, beliefs, creeds and all things, for which men have so far lived and fought are in the melting pot, democracy is in the air but not that democracy which has brought the old world near its end in one

great war. We are promised a new kind of democracy which would make no distinctions of colour, creed, caste, civilisation or culture. It would recognise no barrier between men and men which are the outcome of artificial social distinctions. It aims to raise the dignity of *MAN* as such. Under the circumstances, it is our duty to take into consideration more than we ever did before, the interests of those who are for the present mere men and women, with no adjectives or prefixes before their names to enable them either to vote for the legislative assemblies of the country or to exercise any other political right, giving them a voice in the determination of their destinies. These men and women have begun to think, not that they did not think before. Thank God, the mases of this country have never been unthinking animals. But what they used to think of before is different from what they are thinking now. In one word, they have begun to think politically. Bitter experience, economic want, Rowlatt Bills and the Martial Law orders, have indeed not only taught them to think politically but also to think vigorously. They feel and realise more keenly and more actively than they perhaps ever did before the difference between politically free men and those that are not so. In

certain respects they are already ahead of those who are supposed to have a stake in the country. They feel that the men without property have a greater and more real stake in the country than men with property. The latter can go and settle and live wherever they like. The whole world is open to them. They are perfectly welcome in every civilised country. But the former can go nowhere except as indentured coolies or as mercenary soldiers privileges of which they are already quite sick. They want their country for themselves and they are keen on getting it as soon as circumstances permit. Under the circumstances, let me beg of you to think well before you decide the momentous question before you. Whatever you decide, be prepared to act up to your decision regardless of the consequences to your personal interest. Let not your decisions be vitiated by considerations of personal or class interests.

The Masses.

The general public, including the masses, are in no mood to be trifled with, either by the Government or by yourselves. They have waited sufficiently long, and they want immediate relief from economic want and from political bondage. They may not understand

complicated questions of financy, currency, military organisation, or the like. They may not be able to express opinions on abstract theories of State, but they do know that the country at present, is not being governed in their interests. They are quite aware of the supercilious claims that are being put forward by British statesmen of all kinds from the O'Dwyers, Sydenhams and Sumners of the Troy school to the Mestons, MacDonnels and Montagus of the democratic wing, that the British can and do look after the interests of the masses of this country even better than their educated countrymen. They know that when the question arises whether vote should be given to "the man on the soil, the man behind the plough, and the man whose life is a question between a crop and a crop," it is the British Statesman who stands between them and the right. They know also that when the question arises of how best to spend the revenue raised from them, the people whose interests get precedence over theirs, are the British civilian, the British army man, the British manufacturer, the British banker, and the British trader. They have seen through the newspapers how lavishly and generously the British Secretary of State has been solicitous of conciliating the British and the Allied highly paid Indian servant

of the Crown by giving them large increments in the princely salaries which they were already enjoying. While the British Government readily recognises that the man drawing from Rs. 500 to Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000 a month is hard hit by the increase in the cost of living, they shut their eyes to the fact that the said increase has cut the very ground from under the feet of the ordinary wage-earner the small agriculturist and the low-paid clerk. Last but not the least, they have seen that however tyranical and oppressive the conduct of a British or Indian officer may be, the greatest punishment, that can be meeted out to him is to be compulsarily retired on a pension, a punishment, which really falls on the tax-payer.

Pensions to Dyer and Smiths.

Just imagine, Ladies and Gentlemen, the iniquity of the fact that the Indian tax-payer, whose women were insulted, whose crops were ruined, whose sons were flogged, who in his own person, or in that of his relatives or countrymen was humiliated, imprisoned and trodden under foot, is being made to pay for the comfortable living in Great Britain of a Michael O'Dwyer and a Bosworth Smith. The other day, when I mentioned Bosworth Smith to a senior Punjab

Civilian, he said "that fellow was mad," yet this same mad man not only ruled districts as big in size perhaps as Wales for a number of years, but still is a burden of Indian revenue.

Believe me, Ladies and Gentlemen, the masses of this country are feeling the hardships of the present system of administration even more keenly than the educated Indian. I do not wish to be an alarmist but let me tell you quite frankly that if the Government and the more comfortably placed among ourselves do not desire a revolution, they have to do something tangible, material and substantial, to remove these impressions and do it quick. The persecution of a few educated leaders will only make the situation worse. Educated leaders, on the whole, exercise a restraining influence. Remove that influence as was done by deporting Drs. Kitchlew and Satyapal and the consequences will be disastrous.

Appointment of Lord Sinha and Messrs. Sarma and Sapru.

The recent appointments of Lord Sinha and of Mr. Sharma and Dr. Sapru, are excellent in themselves. I may even congratulate these gentlemen on their good luck and the Government on their wisdom but as remedies for the

existing discontent they are hopelessly inadequate. A few years before, they might have thrilled our imagination but coming after the Punjab tragedy, they have naturally fallen flat. What people want are not appointments but the power to make them. As nominees of Mr. Montagu upon the people Lord Sinha and Messrs. Shafi, Sarma and Sapru, are the servants of the British Ministry and not of the Indian people. We have every reason to be happy that some of our countrymen will share the loaves and fishes that were so far reserved only for the Britishers. We are also happy that they will have opportunities of serving their country in positions of responsibility and we are confident that they will discharge their duties very well and possibly to the credit of their country. All that may be true, yet we cannot help feeling that they are not the servants of the people of India, but their masters. Ladies and Gentlemen, what we want are not masters, imposed from without, but servants selected and honoured from within. The fact that Lord Sinha might get a salary of a lakh of rupees or more, or that our other friends might get salaries of 80,000 or so does not make us forget that about 40 per cent. of the Indian revenues are spent on the maintenance of an army which is being used for

aggressive Imperial purposes, that millions of our countrymen and countrywomen are denied the ordinary amenities of human life and that they are being ruled by many who share the sentiments of Dyer and Bosworth Smith.

Whatever you decide, remember these facts. The greatest need of the situation is the uplift of the masses, educational, social, as well as economical. Co-operation or non-co-operation, that must be our aim and purpose and that must be our motive and inspiration. The masses must feel that we are working for them, and in their interests.

The lead of the Masses

This leads me to another point. How far we must lead or be led by masses? During the last 6 months since I landed on the 20th of February last, I have been in close touch with the masses of my countrymen. I have seen them in their thousands, in processions at meetings and have met their representatives in private. I have seen their political awakening. It has exceeded my wildest expectations. Under the circumstances, we have to remember that in any programme we make, we must carry the masses along with us. While it will be wrong on our part

to allow our deliberate judgment to be overruled by the masses, it will be equally unwise and perhaps fatal to ignore them. There are some worthy men who are disposed to confound the people with mobs; they believe that true leadership requires the disregard of the opinions and wishes of the people. With due respect to them, I have no hesitation in saying that I do not share their belief. The masses change their character into mobs when they are inflamed by passion and anger, and are filled with a desire for revenge and as a rule this happens, only under grave provocation. In that situation it becomes the duty of the leaders to be firm and save the situation by tact and skill. (The Punjab leaders at Lahore, Amritsar, Gujranwala and Kasur tried to do this and would, I verily believe, have saved the situation but for the meddling and blundering of the bureaucracy who were out for producing a moral effect. The situation at Delhi was actually saved by the tactful leadership of Swami Sharadhanand and the equally wise behaviour of the Chief Commissioner. Such, however, are exceptional occasions). Under ordinary circumstances wise leadership involves understanding of the mass mind in a spirit of sympathy and respect. There may be occasions when majority, or no majority, one has to go by

the voice of one's own conscience but in practical politics such occasions are not frequent nor many. I will therefore beg of my fellow Congressmen to bear these considerations in mind when deciding the question before them. We must arrive at a conclusion satisfactory to the general body of our countrymen in whose interests and for whose welfare we are striving. We must not lose the lead of the people either by marching too far ahead of them, or by lagging behind. Both will be fatal to the best interests of the country.

In their present mood, the masses demand that we shall do something over and above the mere passing of resolutions. But I believe they want also that we shall not lose such opportunities of alleviating their condition and helping them in their little things, as we possess or which the law allows us.

Despotism of a Democracy worse than that of a Monarch.

Ladies and Gentlemen before I conclude, let me submit for your consideration one more thought. There is no such thing as benevolence in international politics. Although there is such a thing as enlightened self interest. The despotism of a democracy is in my judgment more total for subject people than that of an absolute monarch. The

situation which we have to face is from this point of view more difficult and complex than the one your ancestors had to face even under the despotism of an Aurangzeb.

I would therefore very much like to warn my countrymen against being under any delusion as to the justice-loving nature or high-mindedness of any democracy in the world, British or other. I was in this matter disillusioned by my first visit to England in 1905. Since then I have had many opportunities of studying the nature and the character of several democracies (British, American and Japanese) and you may take it from me, that although there are men and women in these democracies who are absolutely just and high-minded, guided by the purest of motives in dealing with subject peoples and backward races, the bulk of them, be they of England or of America, not to speak of Japan, know only one thing, namely, their own interest or the interest of their race. There are sections of these democracies whose own class interests require the destruction of militarism and imperialism and who will therefore sympathise with those of the subject people who are struggling for emancipation. It is wise on your part to ally yourselves with them. But

place no faith in the professions of those who however, liberal, worship at the shrine of Imperialism. The recent Parliamentary debate on the Punjab affairs ought to dispel all illusions if there were any still left, on that score. The Imperialist Liberals in the House of Commons with a few noble exceptions, showed no sympathy for the sufferings of the Punjabees, in spite of the eloquent pleadings of men like Mr. T. J. Bennet, Colonel Wedgwood and Mr. Ben Spoor. Liberals in the House of Lords were among the most violent supporters of the military rule. It was a sight for the gods to see. Lords Curzon, Milner and Birkinhead pleading for conciliation and Lords Ampthil and Macdonnel supporting brute force.

Have as many friends as you can have, among Englishmen and others, but have faith in yourselves and yourselves alone.

It is much better to go rather slowly than be deluded by promises held out to us by people who are not in a position to fulfil those promises, or who do not mean what they say or who promise in diplomatic language. Our progress depends more than any thing else upon the volume and vigour of our own public opinion in this country. It will be

wise to have this supplemented by the moral support of the great nations of the world, since by virtue of being a Member of the League of Nations, we can now legitimately appeal to them for such moral support.

Our success will be determined by the extent of our earnestness, the spirit of self-sacrifice in the leaders, the spirit of self-denial in the rank and file, the power to lead rightously and to be led by rightous men. The time has come when we must decide between the freedom of body and soul and the life of convenience and comparative case which is allowed to a few of us under the present system. If we decide for the former we must be prepared for the consequences. But if we choose the latter we must not cry if we do not get the moon. That is the real issue before you and I know I can leave this issue with confidence in your hands.

APPENDIX.

Striking Tributes

TO

LALA LAJPAT RAI.

Of Lala Lajpat Rai the representative public men of the United States of America spoke thus:

Mr. Dudley Field Malone. Assistant Secretary of State and Collector of Port of New York.

Every time I have met Mr. Rai and grasped his hand and looked into the smile of his eyes I knew that I felt some of the same thrill that ran through the blood of any American who had the fortnue to shake the hand of Pulsaki or Lyfayette or Kosciusko or Kossuth. And so tonight I want to read to you a very simple thought, expressed in language superior to any which I could command, which Kossuth spoke when he came to this country and talked in Faneuil Hall, cradle of American liberty. It has a great name, but there is something in it which saddens my heart. "You should not say" 'American liberty,' said he, "you should say 'Liberty in America.' Liberty should not be either American or European; it should be just liberty. God is God; He is neither America's God nor Europe's God,—He is God. So should liberty be: American liberty has much the sound as if you would say American privilege. And there is the rub. Look up history and when your heart saddens at the fact that liberty never yet was lasting in any corner of the world and in any age, you will find the key of it in the gloomy truth that all who yet were free regarded liberty as their privilege instead of regarding it as a principle."

My fellow-citizens, I can imagine no thought more valuable in its promulgation to the people of America to-day than the

thought that if America is to preserve any of its freedom it must not only have a renaissance of freedom at home, but a rebirth of the spirit of freedom for people everywhere; and tonight you have come to gether to say, I hope, brief farewell to a man who loves his people, and his country, and the freedom of his people, and his country, liberty above all else, who loves and who, happily for them —and, I trust, for him—is going back to them.

*   *   *   *

Editor of "Nation": If I should characterize him it would be in these words: A wise, brave and sound ambassador; a generous and modest interpreter of great races to our American democracy; a profound student of human liberties, with a heart responsive to the upward aspirations of making in every clime. That's the man we are honouring tonight. And I want to give you just one other pledge, Mr. Rai, and that is that you may be sure we shall not only follow your movements, but although you will have left us we shall not be forgetting India; if anything, we shall be working harder for what you have so much at heart.

Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard.

Now, for Americans to espouse the cause of India is not such an easy thing, because I found that one is open to misinterpretation and misunderstanding. Of course you are all, I have no doubt, fully aware that to express a wish for the betterment of conditions in India to-day is to mark yourself clearly as a pro-German. There is no other possible explanation; but if there is another explanation it is that you are hostile to England, that you hate England or you have got a grudge against England, some kind of a grievance, and that is the only other reason which can explain your wanting to interfere in the private concerns of England so far as India is affected. Well, it is difficult; we do not want to seem to interfere in the domestic concerns of our mother nation, and yet we have

a duty laid upon us all to speak out for human liberty under all conditions, wherever the need may be.

'Now I have thought that I would take just a few minutes in reading to you the opinions about India of an English man, to show you that we are not altogether without good English precedent. In fact, that remains one of the great encouragements should the Indian situation, that there is a growing public influence in England in favour of doing the right thing by India. If, that did not exist we should, indeed, have very little hope for better things as long as the bulk of the English people consider that the way to govern India is to govern her by military autocratic force.

* * * *

Miss Soumey Tscheng.

I feel it a privilege to take part in honouring the great Indian nationalist, Mr. Rai. He has done good work for his country; he has worked for the liberation of his own countrymen from an alien rule that has become intolerable. There may be danger for him to go back to India now, but as we have a proverb in China, "unless you enter the tiger's den, you cannot hope to obtain the tiger's cubs." I remember that at the time of the Chinese revolution in 1911 an Indian society in Paris sent to Dr. Sun Yet Sen a message of congratulation. In reply Dr. Sen said. "The torch of liberty which is burning now in China sheds its light upon far-off India." It is to be hoped that that light will become more powerful and brust into flames. When alien rule had become obnoxious in China, we threw it off and formed a government of our own. I think India, too, should have the right to determine its own form of government. India helped China greatly by giving us the beautiful teachings of Buddha. In return, China now sends to that country his new gospel of freedom. shall I repeat the pious wish of Dr. Sen, "The torch of liberty sheds its light upon far-off India."

* * * *

I do not think I was ever more glad to be an Englishman than I am to-night, and the reason why I am glad is that I think it i of supreme importance that England should be repre-sented here on this occasion. It is one of the fatal mistakes that persons make of classing a whole people together and wanting to hang them with one rope. There is no one England; there are many Englands, and the government which is at present governing my country is very rapidly losing the support of every section of the English people,—and personally, I disagree with my govern-ment on almost every conceivable subject, except one, and that one is that at last my government has come to the conclusion that it would be a desirable thing for my friend, Mr. Rai, to go back to India. I agree with my government in that, because I recognize and I hope that the government does, too, that Mr. Rai is a statesman compared with whom very few are equal.

Mr. Pethick Lawrence.

Now, I have talked with Mr. Rai upon what I would like to see happen in India, and what he wishes to happen seems to me not only eminently sound and wise, but as far as I know the English Labour Party, who may very likely be in power in Eng-land before very many months are out, what he wants to see in India will have in every detail their whole-hearted support and sympathy, and if they are the government, it will mean a great deal more than their help and support—they will actually help him to carry it into effect. But Mr. Rai is a statesman and he sees rightly, I think, that evolution is always better than catastrophe. He knows, I imagine, quite well, as I do, that liberty can never be given,—liberty must always be taken; that those who want liberty must never content them-selves with talk,—they must always act. Nevertheless, the most potent action is not violence, but suffering. Now, I know quite well that a great country like India, with more than 300, millions of people, can certainly win its freedom whenever it chooses to take it; I know quite well that no government in my country can prevent the Indian people, if they are sufficiently

determined, from winning their freedom. But they can win their freedom in more than one way: they can win freedom for themselves and then win hatred in their own hearts at the same time; but Mr. Lajpat Rai, as I understand him, and the wiser people in my country would rather see India win freedom—win it for herself, win it by action—with freedom and win friendship at the same time, and friendship in her heart and friendship in our heart.

*　　*　　*　　*

Professor Arthur Pope.

I was to tell you briefly somewhat of the background of Lajpat Rai's career and why we delight to honor him here and give a little echo of the honor which has been his in large measure abroad. I want to remind you of one or two things which in the darkness and silence and long distance you do not know, because of those conditions and because the actual conditions have been rooted in stiff and formal phraseology. The white man's burden has been not a burden of justice or good-will, saving as individuals have carried it out, but it has been a programme of cruelty, of oppression, of dishonor and of infamy that passes belief. Let me remind you of just two or three things that have happened in India as the result of 150 years of enlightened Christian rule.

This is the culmination of imperialism—always greedy, always dishonest, always cruel and always unscrupulous; and it was fighting against such a monstrous procedure which Lajpat Rai and his fellow-patriots saw, that they began in infinite discouragement years ago to straighten things out if they could, and win some measure of freedom. It was a terribly discouraging task,—the people divided, kept in ignorance, weak and sick and famine-stricken, with the English agents encouraging and fanning religious hatred between them; a matter of fact which I could prove if challenged. This was what they faced.

About 1907, thanks to many manifold injustices and brutalities in the Administration of the Law in the Punjab, the peasants were

getting furious. Mr. Rai, at that time beloved of all people throughout the length and breath of India, was a very dangerous man; they would follow him certainly—and to what lengths might they not follow him? The Government thought to get him out of the way, so they looked up his career. They could not find the lightest shadow of any trespass of the law. They dug up an old saw of 1818 (An Obsolete Regulation), and according to this the Government might arrest and deport without trial. They couldn't get him on any breach of the law, so on this inquisitous and infamous mediæval instrument they arrested him one day on his way to the court and hustled him out of the country; and let it be said to the shame forever of Lord Morley that he assented to this, and that shame cannot be wiped out from his otherwise illustrious name—the things that he said, did and authorized at that time. It couldn't be. Laipat Rai, a man of upright and lofty character, who always worked in the open, that he should be so treated stunned all India. After six months they had to let him go, and he returned to India a hero,—as he was before, as he is now, and as he will be when he returns.

I am glad, Mr. Rai, to express a certain personal debt to you for helping me, and with me many Americans to learn certain lessons that we much needed to learn. You have helped us first to learn what all imperialism leads to at home. We have been too inclined to curse this imperialism or that—German imperialism or some other imperialism—and forget this imperialism that is our own. You have helped us much, because, after all English imprialism in India has a certain kind of queer, distorted idealism of its own. If England has failed in her imperialism in India. Let us be assured that in America no one will ever succeed in any kind of imperialism. You have helped us to learn that thing, and those who have admired your efforts to fight the crimes of English imperialism in India have been conscious of many lynchings and thirteen or fourteen burnings as stakes in America; and with all attempts that go anywhere to enforce the will of one people or one class or one rate upon another, you have helped us to learn

that the thing to be fought is not English imperialism or German imperialism, but the power that seeks expression in the lust for mastery and the benefit of a few. You have reminded us of how much the European races have done and how much they have yet to do in brotherhood with the men of Africa and of Asia; and for that we thank you with our hearts.

Mr. B. S. Kamat.

Speaking about Indian opinion, I need hardly assure you that, whatever may be the political party to which a man in India belongs, the feeling about Mr. Rai is that he is incapable of any crime against the Government. I believe orders of deportation without trial must be considered nothing but orders in Council, and the present raising of this embargo, so to speak, on Mr. Rai, is to me a clear certificate for him to go back to his country free for any taint of disloyalty. Certainly the large gathering of American people of high distinction that I see around me to-night is proof positive that his behavior while in this country is greatly to his honor and to the honor of India. Speaking of London opinion, your Chairman just referred in terms to the fact that it was wrong to interfere with the internal problems of England. Surely it is a very delicate matter for one nation to pry into the concerns of another nation but I believe England herself has been looking into the internal question of other countries, on the ground that the spirit of liberty is a world spirit. If that is so, if England is justified in that, in looking into the concerns of smaller nations, it is my opinion that America is also justified in looking into the concerns of England with a friendly eye, not as a hostile critic of England, but as a sympathetie friend and Ally of England; and we shall always value and appreciate whatever you think of England in her concerns regarding India. . . .

After all, the salvation of India lies in the hands of India, as one of the speakers has said, and we, the Indian people, are determined to work for our own salvation in the most constitu-

tional manner. Let me frankly tell you, Mr. Chairman, that your remark that you will watch the career and aims of Mr. Rai after he leaves your hospitable shores has touched me, and I am delighted to find that the American hearts are behind us in whatever we do for our own salvation. If Mr. Rai's exile to this country has been a matter of discomfort to him, at any rate he has this satisfaction, that he carries from this land of liberty a certain spirit, a certain enthusiasm chastened by his stay here, which will stand to us and to him and to his country in very good stead when he goes back to his own dear native land.

The Problem of National Education in India

BY LAJPAT RAI.

Contents:

1. Preface, 2. National Education-Introductory, 3. National ideals, 4. Broad Aims of Indian Education, 5. The Problem, 6. Fisher on Education in England, 7. National Education in India, 8. Teaching of Patriotism, 9. Teaching of Patriotism *(cluded)*, 10. Physical Education, 11. All-India Scheme, 12. Vocational Education, 13. Money Value of Education, 14 Co-operative System of Education 15. Bibliography. **Rs. 4/-**

Modern Review Says: Decidedly most interesting. We are entirely at one with the author's exposition of the true aims and ideals that ought to govern our outlook not only in matters educational but in every sphere of life. We have not seen them stated with greater boldness, precision and mastery of grasp and it seems to us that the second, third and fourth chapters of the book should be circulated by the million among our countrymen in order to produce the effect they ought to produce.

Mr. C. R. Reddy. Inspector-General of Education, Mysore says:

Amongst the educational works by Indian thinkers, the first place should be given to Lala Lajpat Rai's book on National Education. As a corrective to all the vague associations that have gathered round that term, I would strongly recommend this book by Lajpat Rai. He is a very competent authority on Education. He was one of those who had something to do with education before he left India on his travels and during his travels he paid very special attention to educational organisations and what he says is worth reading. I have done so in a purely critical and dispassionate manner, merely to draw attention to some of the weightiest pronouncements on Education.

S. GANESAN & CO., *Triplicane*, ***MADRAS.***

